GLOBAL FUND OBSERVER (GFO), an independent newsletter about the Global Fund provided by Aidspan to over 10,000 subscribers.

Issue 73 – 9 March 2007. (For formatted web, Word and PDF versions of this and other issues, see www.aidspan.org/gfo)

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

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
1. NEWS: "Aidspan Guide to Round 7 Applications to the Global Fund" is Published
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

The *Aidspan Guide to Round 7 Applications to the Global Fund* has just been published. It is accessible at no charge at www.aidspan.org/guides, where various other Aidspan Guides are also available. Versions in French and Spanish will be posted in the next two weeks.

The 250-page Guide provides a step-by-step guide to filling out the Round 7 proposal form. It also discusses the strengths and weakness of proposals submitted in prior rounds of funding, based on an analysis of comments made by the Technical Review Panel. As well, the Guide provides advice on the Round 7 applications process, and a series of links where potential applicants can obtain

information concerning the technical content of their proposals. Finally, the Guide discusses factors that applicants should consider if they plan to submit a regional or Non-CCM proposal.

The Guide is not intended to tell readers what they "should" say in their applications to the Fund. The objective instead is to de-mystify the application process and to provide a clearer feeling of what is expected. It is based on the premise that there is no single "correct" way of completing the proposal form. It encourages applicants to clearly describe their plans to tackle HIV, TB, or malaria; and to make a convincing case that the plans are viable, are capable of delivering the anticipated results, and are something that the applicants are committed to and capable of implementing.

The Guide will also be useful for potential applicants who are trying to decide whether or not to apply in Round 7.

The main sections in the Guide are as follows:

Chapter 1: Introduction and Background
- Overview of the Global Fund
- What Initiatives Will the Global Fund Support?
- Are There Any Restrictions on the Amount of Funding Applicants May Apply For?
- Who is Eligible to Apply to the Global Fund?
- Description of the Applications Process

Chapter 2: Getting Ready to Apply
- Deciding Whether to Apply
- Designing a Process for the Period Before Starting to Fill Out the Proposal Form
- Determining How CCMs Can Make the Best Use of the Private Sector
- Determining How CCMs Can Make the Best Use of CSOs
- Deciding Whether to Submit a Non-CCM Proposal
- Deciding Whether to Submit a Regional Proposal
- Deciding Whether to Submit a Sub-CCM Proposal

Chapter 3: Lessons Learned from Earlier Rounds of Funding
- Strengths
- Weaknesses

Chapter 4: Guidance on the Proposal Process, Technical Content, the Proposal Form and Other Relevant Documents
- General Guidance on the Proposal Process
- General Guidance Concerning the Technical Content of Proposals
- Version of the Proposal Form
- Other Relevant Documents and Links
- Process For Submitting a Proposal
- Some Key Concepts to Be Used in all Proposals
- General Guidance on Filling out the Proposal Form

Chapter 5: Step-by-Step Guide to Filling Out the Round 7 Proposal Form
- Section 1: Proposal Overview
- Section 2: Country Eligibility
- Section 3A: Applicant Type and Eligibility for Funding
- Section 3B: Proposal Endorsement
- Section 4: Component Section
- Section 5: Component Budget

Note: When the Call for Proposals was issued on 1 March 2007, the Global Fund posted a version of the Proposal Form that was "protected", which meant that it was not possible to copy large sections of the form, and it was not possible to search for specific words or strings of text. This was problematic, so on 6 March 2007, the Fund replaced this version with an "unprotected" Word file. People who downloaded the Proposal Form file (in any language) from the Global Fund website before 6 March

2007, and who find that they can't do functions like copy or search, might want to go back to the site and download the newer version.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
2. NEWS: Global Fund Terminates Two Grants to Uganda
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

The Global Fund has permanently terminated two grants to Uganda because of unsatisfactory performance. The grants were a Round 2 malaria grant and a Round 2 TB grant. Uganda will lose about $16 million as a result of this action.

This is the second time that the Fund has taken action regarding these grants. In 2005, the Fund temporarily suspended all of Uganda's grants while problems with financial management were investigated.

The recent grant terminations bring to seven the total number of grants worldwide that the Fund has deemed "No Go" after both the Secretariat and the Board were unwilling to approve an extension from Phase 1 (the first two years of the grant) to Phase 2 (the final three years of the grant).

The seven grants, listed in the following table, involve a total of $125 million in money that will not be disbursed by the Fund and can thus be applied to other grants.

Table: Grants Terminated After Phase 1 as a Result of a "No Go" Board Decision re Phase 2

Board "No Go" decision	Country	Round	Component	Maximum 5-year amount	Actually disbursed	Foregone income
Feb. 2005	Senegal	1	Malaria	$7.1 m.	$1.5 m.	$5.6 m.
Dec. 2005	South Africa	1	HIV/TB	$68.0 m.	$17.9 m.	$50.1 m.
Apr. 2006	Nigeria	1	HIV/AIDS	$27.4 m.	$6.8 m.	$20.7 m.
Apr. 2006	Nigeria	1	HIV/AIDS	$41.8 m.	$12.9 m.	$28.8 m.
Apr. 2006	Pakistan	2	Malaria	$7.7 m.	$3.5 m.	$4.2 m.
Feb. 2007	Uganda	2	Malaria	$35.8 m.	$21.1 m.	$14.7 m.
Feb. 2007	Uganda	2	TB	$5.7 m.	$4.5 m.	$1.1 m.
TOTAL:				**$193.6 m.**	**$68.3 m.**	**$125.3 m.**

Note: The fact that these grants have been terminated is not currently apparent at the Fund's website, though it is understood that this point will soon be addressed.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
3. NEWS: Global Fund Board Approves Two New Round 6 Proposals Following Successful Appeals
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

The Global Fund Board has approved two of the twelve Round 6 proposals whose original rejection had been appealed by the applicants. The newly approved proposals are an HIV/AIDS proposal from Egypt that will cost $5.4 million over the first two years, and a TB proposal from Pakistan that will cost $22.6 million. The approvals are subject to a number of clarifications being successfully responded to in a timely manner.

To be eligible for appeal, a proposal has to be have been turned down for funding in two consecutive rounds. Forty-eight proposals met this criterion in Round 6; CCMs from 12 countries filed appeals, but only two were successful. The unsuccessful appeals were from Afghanistan, Burundi, Chad, Columbia, Comoros, India, Liberia, Nepal, Sudan and Yemen.

The appeals were reviewed by an Independent Appeal Panel, comprised of two members of the TRP, together with an expert designated by WHO, an expert designated by UNAIDS and an expert

designated by the World Bank, all of whom served in their personal capacities. Where a member of the TRP had been a reviewer of a proposal under appeal in Round 6, another expert of the TRP replaced him or her for the relevant discussion. For this reason, five TRP members were involved in the Independent Appeal Panel meeting, although only two TRP members evaluated each appeal considered by the panel.

With respect to the successful appeals from Egypt and Pakistan, the Independent Appeal Panel found that the TRP had erred in some of the weaknesses it had identified and that the TRP errors were sufficient to justify a change in ranking from Category 3 to Category 2. However, the Panel said that the proposals should only be funded following successful completion of a number of clarifications that the Panel identified. For the most part, these clarifications were based on weaknesses identified by the TRP in its original review of the proposal.

With respect to the unsuccessful appeals, the Independent Review Panel found that while the TRP had made some errors, they were not sufficient to require a change in the Category 3 ranking; or that the information in the appeal document raised questions of judgment rather than questions of significant and obvious error on the part of the TRP; or that the explanations provided by the appellant in the appeal document were inadequate; or that the appeal was based on new information rather than explanations of the information already submitted in the proposal (which is contrary to Board policy) – or some combination of the above.

The Independent Appeal Panel suggested that the TRP limit the use of terminology that could be interpreted in several ways, and avoid judgmental comments such as "unclear" or "excessive," opting instead for greater specificity on the issue in question.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
4. NEWS: Global Fund Releases Report on Results and Future Challenges
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

The Global Fund has released a progress report entitled "Partners in Impact – Results Report 2007." The report is one of several documents released by the Fund in preparation for the Second Replenishment Meeting that was held earlier this week in Oslo. The documents are available at www.theglobalfund.org/en/about/replenishment/oslo.

"Partners in Impact" reports on the results achieved by the Global Fund to 31 December 2006. It provides information on the impact that Global Fund grants have had on the three diseases, including on the level of services provided. As well, the report discusses the performance of Global Fund grants, provides many examples of success stories, and identifies problem areas and future challenges. Finally, the report describes efforts to evaluate Global Fund operations.

Some of the topics covered in the report are: how well country partnerships are working; progress made in developing in-country monitoring and evaluation systems; the role of the Global Fund in ensuring aid effectiveness; the effects of Global Fund grants on health systems; the contributions that civil society has made to the implementation of programmes funded by Global Fund grants; lessons to be learned from high-performing TB grants; and the need to strengthen local systems for the delivery of services (referred to as "community systems strengthening" or "CSS").

Note: *The version of this document that was originally posted by the Fund had very small print and was hard to read. People who downloaded that version may want to know that the Fund has now posted a much more legible version.*

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
5. ANALYSIS: The Major Strengths and Weaknesses of Previous Applications to the Fund
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

Chapter 3 of *"The Aidspan Guide to Round 7 Applications to the Global Fund,"* announced above, discusses the strengths and weaknesses of applications submitted in Rounds 3 through 6. The list provided is based on an extensive analysis of comments made on those applications by the TRP.

The <u>strengths</u> identified most often in the TRP comments were as follows:

1. The proposal was clear, well organised and well-documented; the strategy was sound.

2. The proposal demonstrated complementarity – i.e., it built on existing activities, including national strategic plans, and/or it built on earlier programmes financed by the Global Fund.

3. There was good involvement of partners (including NGOs and other sectors) in the implementation plan.

4. The proposal contained a good situational analysis.

5. There was a strong political commitment to implement the programme.

Other strengths identified fairly frequently were as follows:

6. The programme targeted high-risk groups and vulnerable populations.

7. The proposal demonstrated sustainability – i.e., national budgets were identified to help sustain the activities once Global Fund support terminates.

8. The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan was solid.

9. The budget was well detailed, well presented and reasonable.

10. The proposal reflected comments made by the TRP during earlier rounds of funding.

11. There was good collaboration between HIV and TB.

12. The programme was realistic with respect to what could be accomplished, and/or had a limited and concentrated focus.

13. The proposal demonstrated good co-funding.

14. The PR is a strong organisation, with experience managing similar programmes.

15. The proposal included capacity building measures and identified technical support needs.

16. The proposal contained innovative strategies, some of which could lead to best practices.

17. The proposal built on lessons learned and best practices.

18. The proposal had a strong human rights focus.

19. The proposal contained solid strategies for procurement and supply management (PSM).

20. The CCM was strong and had wide sectoral representation.

21. The proposal was developed through a transparent, participatory process.

22. The proposal acknowledged issues of absorptive capacity.

23. The proposal described solid strategies for managing the programme.

24. The proposal contained solid indicators and targets.

25. The proposal identified the SRs, and/or provided a good description of the process for identifying the SRs.

26. The proposal contained a strong section on health systems strengthening (HSS).

The <u>weaknesses</u> identified most often by the TRP – many of which are the flipside of the above strengths – were as follows:

1. The narrative description of the programme was inadequate. There was insufficient, unclear or questionable information on one or more of the following: the rationale, the strategic approach, the objectives, the activities, the indicators, the targets and the expected outcomes.

2. The budget information was inaccurate, questionable and/or not sufficiently detailed.

3. The proposal did not demonstrate complementarity or additionality; it was not clear how the programme related or added to existing programmes, including programmes funded by the Global Fund through earlier grants.

4. The proposal did not contain a good situational (i.e., gap) analysis.

Other weaknesses identified frequently were as follows:

5. Some of the proposed approaches or activities were inappropriate.

6. There were problems concerning the PR(s) or the SR(s).

7. The various sections of the proposal were not well aligned.

8. The M&E plan was inadequate.

9. The programme was too ambitious; some or all of the goals, objectives and targets were not realistic.

10. The use of partners (including NGOs) in the implementation of the programme was inadequate or unclear.

11. The programme did not focus sufficiently on vulnerable groups.

12. The plan for procurement and supply chain management was inadequate.

13. The proposal failed to adequately address issues of capacity building and technical assistance.

14. The proposal failed to address weaknesses identified by the TRP for proposals submitted in earlier rounds of funding.

15. Insufficient attention was paid to human rights issues.

16. The budget (and therefore the programme) was imbalanced; too much or too little was allocated to one or more sectors or activities.

17. There were problems with the structure or functioning of the CCM.

18. The proposal did not adequately explain the roles and responsibilities of the various players.

19. The proposal development process was not sufficiently transparent or inclusive.

20. The proposal demonstrated insufficient co-funding.

21. In HIV/AIDS and TB proposals, there were either no joint activities or insufficient joint activities involving both diseases; or the information on joint activities was incomplete.

22. The treatment, care and support component of the proposal was missing or inadequate.

23. The proposal failed to demonstrate absorptive capacity.

24. Information on sustainability was lacking.

25. How health systems will be strengthened was not well explained.

26. There was a lack of information in the proposal concerning problems with previous Global Fund grants.

27. The proposal failed to make the case for additional funding over and above that received from earlier grants.

28. There was insufficient information on how the project would be coordinated.

"The Aidspan Guide to Round 7 Applications to the Global Fund" discusses all of these in detail, and provides links to proposals and TRP comments that provide illustrations of the strengths.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
6. SHORT ITEMS
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

Friends of the Global Fund Africa

Last month, "Friends of the Global Fund Africa" (Friends Africa) held its inaugural meeting in Kigali, Rwanda. This is the fourth "Friends" organization to be established; the others are in the USA, Japan and Europe. Each of them is formally independent of the Fund.

The Kigali meeting was opened by Rwanda's President, Paul Kagame. Some two hundred attendees, half from Rwanda and half from the rest of Africa, participated in two days of meetings under the theme "Africans Taking Responsibility and Achieving Results in the Fight against AIDS, TB and Malaria."

The Chair of Friends Africa is Mr. Aigboje Aig-Imoukhuede (Managing Director, Access Bank Plc). Board members include Ms. Jeannette Kagame (First Lady, Rwanda), General Yakubu Gowon (Former President, Nigeria), Dr. Akudo Anyanwu Ikemba (CEO, Friends Africa), Professor Sheila Tlou (Minister of Health, Botswana), Dr. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala (Former Minister of Finance, Nigeria), and Mr. Jonathan Oppenheimer (CEO, De Beers South Africa).

The meeting included workshops on how Friends Africa can involve civil society, the private sector and governments in the work of the Fund. An award for commitment was presented to Rev. Gideon Byamugisha, founder of the African Network of Religious Leaders Living with or Personally Affected by HIV and AIDS.

Record US Pledge to the Fund

The United States Congress has resolved that the US will give $724 million to the Global Fund in 2007, one-third more than the US has given in any previous year. The US is by far the Global Fund's largest single donor, having provided 29 percent of all pledges received by the Fund to date, although European Union member states together have provided more than half of the Fund's support.

Tools for Round 7 TB Proposals

The Stop TB Department at WHO has released a set of planning tools for CCMs developing Round 7 TB proposals. See www.who.int/tb/dots/planningframeworks/gf_tb_proposals_preparation.

Members Sought for Developing Country NGOs Global Fund Board Delegation

Representatives of NGOs in developing countries are invited to apply for membership of the Global Fund board delegation that represents this sector. Nine people will be chosen to join the delegation that will attend two board meetings per year. One of those delegation members will later be chosen by the delegation to become the Alternate board member. All positions are unpaid, though travel expenses are covered. The deadline for applications has been extended to March 15. A copy of the document providing full details and application instructions has been placed at www.aidspan.org/documents/other/call-for-delegation-members.doc.

HIV/AIDS Implementers' Meeting Announces Call for Abstracts

PEPFAR, together with the Global Fund, WHO, and others, has announced a call for abstracts for a meeting of implementers of HIV/AIDS projects worldwide that will be held in Kigali, Rwanda, on June 16-19. The deadline for submission of abstracts is March 15. Details are available at www.hivimplementers.com.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
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 over 10,000 subscribers in 170 countries at least twelve times per year.

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

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

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

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 information on all approved 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.