GLOBAL FUND OBSERVER (GFO), an independent newsletter about the Global Fund provided by Aidspan to over 7,000 subscribers in 170 countries.

Issue 84: 29 January 2008. (For formatted web, Word and PDF versions of this and other issues, see www.aidspan.org/gfo)

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

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
1. ANALYSIS AND COMMENTARY: Are CCMs Complying with the Global Fund Requirements Concerning the Selection of CCM Members?
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

by David Garmaise, Senior Analyst, Aidspan

Since April 1, 2005, the Global Fund has had six minimum requirements that CCMs must meet if their proposals to the Fund are to be considered. One of these is that CCM members representing the non-governmental sectors must be selected by their own sectors through a transparent process. Almost three years later, some questions remain about the extent to which CCMs are complying with this requirement.

This article (1) provides background information on this topic; (2) presents an analysis conducted by Aidspan (publisher of GFO) on Round 6 applications; (3) provides some additional information on the Round 7 experience; (4) briefly describes efforts by the Global Fund Secretariat to educate CCMs concerning this requirement; and (5) presents some concluding remarks.

1. Introduction and Background

The Global Fund's CCM Guidelines (*"Revised Guidelines on the Purpose, Structure and Composition of Country Coordinating Mechanisms and Requirements for Grant Eligibility"*) state that "CCM members representing the non-government sectors must be selected/elected by their own sector(s) based on a documented, transparent process, developed within each sector." The Global Fund defines "non-government sectors" as including the academic and educational sector; the NGOs and community-based organisations sector; the people living with HIV/AIDS, TB and/or malaria sector; the private sector; and the religious and faith-based organisations sector.

The requirement concerning the selection process for members from the non-governmental sectors is one of what the Global Fund terms the "six minimum requirements" that CCMs must meet before their applications to the Fund will be considered.

For each new round of funding, the Global Fund Secretariat sets up a Screening Review Panel to review whether the CCMs submitting proposals are compliant with the six requirements (and also whether they are compliant with certain other technical requirements, such as the country's income level). If a CCM is regarded as not being compliant, any proposal that the CCM has submitted is "screened out" – that is, it is not presented to the TRP for consideration. All other proposals are "screened in" – that is, they are passed to the TRP for consideration. During the screening in or out, the Secretariat is not evaluating the proposals themselves, it is evaluating whether the CCMs are compliant with the requirements.

Most of the six CCM requirements were initially adopted by the Global Fund Board in November 2004. When Round 5 was launched several months later, the CCMs had not had much time to ensure that they met the new requirements. Consequently, it appears that the Secretariat exercised some discretion – that is, was far from strict – when it screened the applications for Round 5.

It is our understanding, however, that during grant negotiations for successful Round 5 proposals, the Secretariat started insisting on seeing documentation to prove that at least some efforts had been made to meet the requirements; and that, in fact, in many cases the signing of the grant agreement was held up while the necessary documents were produced.

By the time the call for proposals for Round 6 was issued on 5 May 2006, CCMs had had about 18 months to implement the new requirements. Consequently, one might have expected that the Secretariat would have been stricter about enforcing the requirements when it screened the applications for Round 6. Of the 96 Round 6 proposals submitted by CCMs, 93 were screened in, thus implying that the vast majority of CCMs were meeting the new requirements. However, it was not known just how strictly the Secretariat applied the new rules during the screening process for Round 6. Did the Secretariat continue to exercise some discretion? If it did, were there still a number of CCMs not meeting the new requirements?

One has to place this whole discussion in context. For many countries, the minimum requirements were a completely foreign concept. Even once the requirements were explained, these countries had to incorporate them into their own political and social context. In some ways, the requirements required a democratization of decision-making in the health field in countries that were used to an authoritarian public health system. Viewed in this context, it can be argued that 18 months was still a very short time to expect all countries to comply.

2. Aidspan's analysis of Round 6 proposals

The Round 6 proposal form required applicants to describe the selection processes used by the various sectors. An analysis conducted by Aidspan of about two-thirds of Round 6 proposal forms revealed that most CCMs failed to describe the selection processes followed by the non-government sectors. The results of this analysis are provided below.

> **Caution:** It is not possible to draw definitive conclusions from this analysis concerning whether these CCMs complied with the Global Fund requirements, for two reasons: (1) the analysis that Aidspan undertook had several limitations (these are explained below); and (2) the Global Secretariat did not rely solely on the information provided in the applications. Nevertheless, the analysis raises some questions about compliance that should be pursued.

Aidspan examined what CCMs reported on 61 Round 6 applications concerning the selection process for CCM members from three of the non-governmental sectors – the NGOs and community-based organisations sector; the religious and faith-based organisations sector; and the people living with the diseases sector. (Of the 93 proposals that were screened in, only 61 were approved; Aidspan was able to access these proposals, but did not have access to proposals that were not approved.)

Round 6 applicants were required to describe on the proposal form itself the selection process used by each sector; applicants were also required to attach supporting documents providing more details on the selection processes.

The major findings of Aidspan's analysis were as follows:

- **NGOs and community-based organisations sector:** Just over half of the CCMs indicated on the proposal form that there was a selection process run by the sector itself. However, only a third of the CCMs actually described the process on the proposal form.

- **Religious and faith-based organisations sector:** Only a third of the CCMs indicated on the proposal form that there was a selection process run by the sector itself, and only one in eight CCMs actually described the process on the proposal form.

- **People living with the diseases sector:** Just over a quarter of the CCMs indicated on the proposal form that there was a selection process run by the sector itself, and less than one in nine CCMs actually described the process on the proposal form.

As can be seen from the above, a large number of CCMs did not even indicate on the proposal form that there was a process to select CCM members from these three sectors. And, of those CCMs that did indicate that there was a selection process, only a fraction actually described the process on the proposal form itself.

The following are two examples of selection processes for the NGO sector that were well described on the proposal forms:

- From a proposal submitted by Georgia: "[T]he rotational members of the NGO/CSOs sector are elected on an annual basis by the respective sectoral forums – coalitions. Elections are performed through a documented and transparent process – e-mail forums among the NGO coalition partners. In particular, the 2 NGOs representing HIV/AIDS NGO/CSO sector at the CCM have been elected through the open e-mail, transparent voting process led by the PTF [Prevention Task Force]. The NGO "Tanadgoma" and "Save the Children International Federation" have been elected as the rotational members starting for October 2004-

December 2005. Subsequent elections in January 2006 determined a new member NGO "Bemoni" and has retained the mandate of "Save the Children" till end of 2006. Next round of elections is planned in January 2007."

- From a proposal submitted by the Maldives: "All 25 [NGOs] operating in the Maldives were invited to attend a meeting to discuss the submission of this proposal. At that meeting, expressions of interest to participate on the CCM were called for. Four nongovernment organizations nominated and were supported by the other organizations present at the meeting to join the CCM."

Most of the CCMs that said there was a selection process for the NGO sector, but that failed to describe the process on the proposal form, did one or both of the following: (a) they explained what the CCM had done to request that the NGO sector implement a selection process; and/or (b) they simply stated that the NGO sector had nominated its representatives. The following are two examples:

- "After a review in 2002, it was recommended that each civil society sector should nominate their own representatives, which would in turn be formally appointed by the Chairperson of the CCM. That process is as follows: 1. Sectors establish their own sectoral processes for elections, and submit a report and nominee to the Chair of CCM for appointment. 2. The CCM recommends that national stakeholders in a particular sector should be brought together in a summit to elect a representative. 3. If sectors request, the process of nominating a representatives may be financed by the CCM. 4. Notifications of the nominated candidate are submitted to the CCM secretariat in writing...."

- "In order to fulfill the latest Global Fund requirements, original CCM constituents from NGOs/civil society, faith-based organizations (FBOs), and the private sector nominated representatives for the streamlined CCM, using a transparent and democratic process."

Sometimes, it was not clear from the information on the proposal form whether there was a proper selection process in place. For example:

- "The [CCM] is composed of 36 members, including 12 from civil society…. These representatives were selected within their institution according to their internal procedure."

Limitations of the analysis

There are several limitations to the analysis that Aidspan performed:

1. Aidspan did not have access to the supporting documents attached to the proposals. It is our understanding that some CCMs described their selection process in these supporting documents even though they did not include a summary of the process on the proposal form itself.

2. The proposal form did not specifically instruct applicants to describe the selection process for the people living with the diseases sector, even though several Global Fund documents, including the FAQs (Frequently Asked Questions) that accompanied the Round 6 call for proposals, stated that the representatives of this sector must be chosen by the sector itself. Because of the way the proposal form was worded, some applicants may have concluded that they did not need to describe the selection process for this sector.

3. Of the CCMs that had proposals approved in Round 6, there was no information whatsoever on the selection processes for five CCMs. Each of these CCMs submitted more than one component, but only one component was approved, and only the approved component was posted on the Global Fund website. It is possible that these CCMs provided information on the selection processes in a component that was not approved, and that this information was not repeated in the component that was approved and posted on the website.

As well, Aidspan has been informed that when the Round 6 applications were screened by the Secretariat and assessed for compliance with the selection process requirements, the Secretariat did not rely solely on the information provided on the proposal form or in supporting documents attached

to the proposal. In fact, whenever the information contained in the application was inadequate to assess compliance, Secretariat staff took one or both of the following steps: (a) they asked for more information from the CCMs in question; and/or (b) they talked to in-country partners of the CCMs in question and the relevant Fund Portfolio Managers in the Secretariat.

<u>Questions raised by the analysis</u>

Despite its limitations, the analysis raises two questions that are worthy of further discussion.

Is the Secretariat being sufficiently transparent?

Transparency is one of the core philosophies of the Global Fund. Indeed, with respect to the requirement that CCM members from the non-government sectors be selected by the sectors themselves, the Fund requires that the selection processes be transparent and be documented. Wherever possible, therefore, the Secretariat should also operate in a transparent fashion. And yet:

- for the Round 6 applications that were approved, only the proposal form was made public (Aidspan was not able to access the supporting documents);

- Round 6 applications that were not approved were not made public; (Note: the Global Fund Board subsequently decided that beginning in Round 7, all proposals will be made public, whether or not they were approved.)

- no people from outside the Global Fund Secretariat were included on the team that screened the applications, including when the Secretariat took additional steps to determine whether the CCM applicants were in compliance with Global Fund requirements concerning the selection processes; and

- the Secretariat did not make public the report it prepared on the screening process, including the additional steps it undertook to determine compliance and the information it collected.

As a result, Aidspan has not been ably to fully assess whether the CCMs met the requirements concerning the selection process for CCM members.

Because the Secretariat did not include people from outside the Secretariat in the screening process, and did not report on the results of the additional steps it took to determine compliance, we have to take the Secretariat's word for it that 93 of the 96 Round 6 CCM applicants were indeed compliant.

In our view, the Secretariat ought to have at least issued a report. While it may not have been possible to prepare a report at the time the screening was done (due to time pressures), the Secretariat could have prepared a report after the screening was completed, while the applications were being reviewed by the Technical Review Panel (TRP).

The Secretariat should also have considered adding some people from outside the Secretariat to its screening team when it decided to take additional steps to verify compliance. Logically, these people should have been representatives of civil society.

Is there a need to review or better explain the requirements?

Despite the fact that 93 of the 96 applications from CCMs were screened in, it is likely that the Global Fund Secretariat exercised some discretion in Round 6 (as in Round 5) and that in reality some CCMs are struggling with some of the requirements. If this is indeed the case, one has to ask why they are struggling.

Perhaps some of the requirements are too strict, in which case consideration should be given to altering some of the language of the requirements to make them less onerous. It should be possible to do this while still respecting the spirit of the requirements.

On the other hand, perhaps the best approach is for the Secretariat to continue to exercise discretion in certain instances. As indicated above, for some countries, meeting the minimum requirements is a significant challenge. It may take these countries several years to fully comply. Perhaps allowing the Secretariat to take the country context into account and to interpret the minimum requirements with a

certain degree of flexibility is an entirely appropriate way to proceed. But if that approach is taken, the Secretariat needs to be transparent concerning both its process and its decisions.

It may also be necessary for the Global Fund Secretariat and others to step up efforts to assist CCMs to better understand the requirements and to fully comply with them. (Some of the Secretariat's current efforts in this regard are described below.)

It is difficult to know which approach, or which combination of approaches, is best without knowing more about the extent to which some CCMs are struggling to meet the minimum requirements and why they are struggling.

3. The Round 7 experience

Of the 80 Round 7 proposals submitted from CCMs, 77 were screened in, again implying that the vast majority of CCMs are meeting the new requirements. Nevertheless, the *"Report of the Technical Review Panel and the Secretariat on Round 7 Proposals"* states that potential applicants in Round 8 are "strongly encouraged to work with partners, the Global Fund Secretariat, and specifically the Fund Portfolio cluster working in that region, to fully understand the minimum requirements for eligibility, including the minimum level of documentation that is required to demonstrate compliance with those requirements." (The full report is available at www.theglobalfund.org/en/about/technical/report/.) This suggest that, at the very least, more work needs to be done to ensure that CCMs better understand what the minimum requirements are, how to comply with them, and how to prepare the required documentation..

As was the case in Round 6, the Secretariat did not include people from outside the Secretariat in the screening, and did not publicly issue a report on the screening process, including the results of the additional steps the Secretariat took to determine compliance.

4. Efforts by the Global Fund Secretariat to educate CCMs

The Global Fund Secretariat has made efforts to educate CCMs concerning the minimum requirements. The requirements are described in the CCM Guidelines and are further explained in the "Clarifications on CCM Requirements – Round 7 (both documents are available at www.theglobalfund.org/en/apply/mechanisms/guidelines/). Additional information on the CCM minimum requirements was included in the FAQs that the Fund prepared for Round 7; the information included a list of the materials that CCMs need to provide to demonstrate compliance with the requirements. The Fund will likely issue updated versions of the clarifications and FAQ documents for Round 8.

In addition, drawing on lessons learned from Round 6, the Secretariat participated in regional meetings between March and early May 2007 (soon after the launch of Round 7). As reported in the *"Report of the Technical Review Panel and the Secretariat on Round 7 Proposals,"* at these meetings the Secretariat, among other things, "further explain[ed] the Global Fund's minimum requirements for applicant eligibility, and (as relevant to the meeting attendees), review[ed] examples of the types of documents required to evidence compliance with those minimum requirements."

Finally, the Secretariat recently established a global framework contract enabling it to engage the services of consultants who can help CCMs better understand the minimum requirements.

5. Conclusion

The bottom line is (a) that we do not really know to what extent CCMs are complying with the requirement that members representing the non-governmental sectors must be selected by their own sectors through a transparent process; and (b) that the Global Fund Secretariat has not been particularly transparent concerning its assessment of compliance during the proposal screening process.

Are most CCMs in compliance with this requirement and the other minimum requirements? Is there a need to step up efforts to educate CCMs concerning the requirements? Is there a need to re-visit the

wording of some of the requirements? It is appropriate for the Secretariat to continue to exercise discretion in the screening process? These are all questions that merit further discussion.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
2. NEWS: Chevron Corporation Donates US$30 Million to the Global Fund
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

Chevron Corporation, one of the world's leading integrated energy companies, has become the Global Fund's first "Corporate Champion," donating US$30 million over three years to support programmes financed by the Fund in parts of Asia and Africa. process.

With the announcement of this donation on 21 January 2008, the Global Fund officially launched its Corporate Champions Program, which the Fund describes as "an innovative way for multinational corporations to significantly invest in the fight against the three diseases." The plan is that each Corporate Champion will contribute to Global Fund-supported programs in the countries where the company operates.

Corporate Champions are required to demonstrate a long-term commitment to fighting global health issues. The Global Fund says that Chevron was selected as the inaugural partner "as a result of its highly-successful community engagement programs tackling AIDS and malaria and its award-winning HIV/AIDS workplace programs."

Corporate Champions are also expected to support health programs in other ways. For example, it has been reported that local Chevron employees will provide assistance to Global Fund projects in six countries.

The launch of the Corporate Champions program and the announcement of the Chevron donation are important developments for the Global Fund, which has had a long-standing goal of increasing investments from the private sector.

A copy of the press release announcing these developments can be downloaded from the Global Fund's home page at www.theglobalfund.org.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
3. NEWS: Revised *"Aidspan Guide to Round 8 Applications to the Global Fund – Volume 1: Getting a Head Start"* is Released
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

Aidspan has released a revised version of Volume 1 of *"The Aidspan Guide to Round 8 Applications to the Global Fund."* It is accessible at no charge at www.aidspan.org/guides, where various other Aidspan Guides are also available.

The revised version, dated 17 January, updates some of the information provided in the original version, which was described in Issue #83 of GFO (available at www.aidspan.org/gfo). In particular, the revised version contains new information on:

- eligibility requirements for Round 8 with respect to what the Fund now refers to as "cost-sharing" (these replace the eligibility requirements with respect to what the Fund used to refer to as "counterpart financing"); and

- measures adopted by the Board designed to make it easier to fund health systems strengthening activities (these measures will be reflected in the Round 8 proposal form and guidelines).

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
4. EXCERPTS: Four Excerpts from *"The Aidspan Guide to Round 8 Applications to the Global*
Fund – Volume 1: Getting a Head Start"
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

Following are four sample excerpts from the revised version of *"The Aidspan Guide to Round 8*
Applications to the Global Fund – Volume 1: Getting a Head Start," whose publication was announced
in GFO #83 (available at www.aidspan.org/gfo) and whose update was announced above. The guide
itself is accessible at www.aidspan.org/guides.

Excerpt 1: The Importance of Getting a Head Start

Work on an application for a Global Fund grant should start well in advance of the Fund's call for
proposals for any given round of funding.

Judging by the experience of recent rounds of funding, once the call for proposals is issued,
applicants have about four months to submit their proposals. Applicants will need the majority of this
time to fill out what has always been a rather complicated proposal form, and to obtain the necessary
approvals and signatures. For this reason, and because the Global Fund requires that applicants
engage in a process of soliciting and reviewing in-country submissions for possible inclusion in the
country coordinated proposal, Aidspan recommends that applicants begin working on their proposals
at least a few months ahead of the [March 1] call for proposals.

Excerpt 2: Designing the Proposal Development Process

Each proposal to the Global Fund is different, so CCMs need to design a process that fits with their
specific requirements. The following is a list of actions that CCMs may want to include in their
process:
- Analyse the strengths and weaknesses of previously submitted proposals.
- Define the overall project focus.
- Assign responsibilities for proposal development.
- Identify, assign and manage the resources needed for the proposal development process.
- Implement a process for soliciting and reviewing submissions for possible integration into the
  proposal.
- Draft the proposal components.
- Identify the PRs and SRs.
- Compile and submit the final proposal.
- Maintain regular communications.

Although there is some logic to the order in which the actions have been presented, this sequence is
by no means the only way to organise the process. Indeed, some of the actions (like drafting the
proposal components and maintaining regular communications) are likely to take place in a
continuous way during the whole process.

CCMs need to decide which actions to include and in what order they should be done. CCMs should
also ensure that their process meets all of the Global Fund requirements and is properly documented.
Once the main actions have been decided on, the CCM should also develop a feasible timeline,
ensuring that adequate time is left at the end of the process to secure the approval of all members of
the CCM and to make any final changes.

(In the next section of this chapter, each action is presented and discussed in detail.)

Excerpt 3: Managing the Proposal Development Process

CCMs are multi-entity committees, not executive bodies. Although CCMs are responsible for
proposal development, trying to have the entire CCM manage the development process can be quite
a challenge. During past funding rounds, many CCMs have established smaller proposal
development teams (or committees) to do most of the work involved. The roles of these teams can
vary and will depend on what is needed in each context. Some suggestions are provided below.

Component-Specific Teams

It is common practice for CCMs to set up a different team to work on each disease component (if they are planning to apply for more than one component). These teams can take on all or several of the following tasks:
- Ensure that a general situation analysis related to the response to the disease is conducted.
- Based on the situational analysis, define the overall focus of the proposal.
- Define the proposal development process that will be followed, complete with timelines.
- Coordinate the process of soliciting and reviewing submissions from a broad range of stakeholders for possible integration into the proposal.
- Write, or oversee the writing of, the final proposal for the component.
- Ensure that the process followed is well documented.
- Present the content of the component-specific proposal to the CCM, and provide clarifications and revisions as required.

The proposal development process may be different for each component.

Proposal Coordination Team

If your CCM does establish a proposal development teams for each component, we suggest that you also consider setting up an additional team to bring the different components together and to coordinate the entire proposal. In order to do this effectively, it may make sense for at least one member of each component-specific team to participate in meetings of the proposal coordination team.

Excerpt 4: Lessons Learned from Earlier Rounds of Funding

The strengths identified most often in the TRP comments on approved proposals submitted during Rounds 3-7 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. The proposal reflected comments made by the TRP during earlier rounds of funding.

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. There was a strong political commitment to implement the programme.
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 following strength began to emerge during Round 7:
27. Operational research was built into the proposal.

(The observations of the TRP concerning each of these strengths are described in the balance of this chapter. Many extracts of TRP comments on individual proposals are included. For each extract, the country involved has been identified, and links have been provided to both the full TRP comments from which the extract was taken and to the proposal that the TRP was commenting on.)

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
5. NEWS: French- and Spanish-Language Versions of *"The Aidspan Guide to Round 8 Applications to the Global Fund – Volume 1: Getting a Head Start"* are Released
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

"The Aidspan Guide to Round 8 Applications to the Global Fund – Volume 1: Getting a Head Start (First Edition – Revised)" is now available in French and Spanish at www.aidspan.org/guides. The English version of the guide was posted earlier in January. For a full description of the contents of the guide, see Issue 83 of GFO (available at www.aidspan.org/gfo). The next two articles report this news in French and Spanish.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
6. ANNONCE : Publication des versions française et espagnole du *"Guide de l'Aidspan sur les candidatures à la huitième série de demandes de subvention au Fonds mondial – Tome 1 : S'y prendre tôt"*
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

[Editor's note: This article is an adaptation in French of an article that appeared in English in GFO Issue #83.]

Les versions française et espagnole du *"Guide de l'Aidspan sur les candidatures à la huitième série de demandes de subventions au Fonds mondial - Tome 1 : S'y prendre tôt (Première édition - Révisée)"* viennent tout juste d'être publiées. On peut les télécharger sans frais à l'adresse www.aidspan.org/guides où l'on trouve également d'autres guides de l'Aidspan.

Le premier tome contient des renseignements et des directives (a) pour aider les candidats éventuels qui se demandent s'ils doivent soumettre une demande de subvention dans le cadre de la huitième série; et (b), pour donner, à ceux qui décident de le faire, un coup de pouce relativement au processus d'élaboration de la proposition (y compris le processus de sollicitation des minipropositions en vue de leur intégration possible à la proposition nationale). Y sont également analysés les facteurs que devraient prendre en considération les candidats éventuels qui comptent soumettre une proposition régionale ou une proposition hors ICN. Enfin, on y retrouve une analyse détaillée des points forts et des points faibles des propositions soumises dans le cadre des appels de propositions précédents fondée sur les commentaires formulés par les membres du Comité technique d'examen des propositions (CTEP).

Le tome 2 (qui paraîtra dès que possible, une fois que le Fonds mondial aura lancé officiellement son appel de propositions, le 1er mars 2008), fournira des directives additionnelles sur le processus de soumission d'une demande de subvention et sur la façon de remplir le formulaire de proposition de la huitième série.

Depuis la quatrième série d'octrois de subventions, Aidspan publie un guide relatifs à la présentation d'une demande de subvention pour chaque nouvelle série. C'est la première fois que l'organisme publie ce guide en deux tomes. Cette démarche rejoint le conseil d'Aidspan (et d'autres acteurs) voulant que les candidats entreprennent la rédaction de leur proposition bien avant que ne soit lancé l'appel de propositions du Fonds mondial. Les renseignements sur le processus d'élaboration de la

proposition que contient le premier tome sont bien plus abondants que ceux que renferment les guides relatifs à la présentation d'une demande de subvention publiés par le passé.

(Le candidat voudra peut-être utiliser le premier tome conjointement avec les « Documents de l'Aidspan concernant la soumission de minipropositions », publiés en décembre 2007 (voir l'avis à cet effet dans le *numéro 82 du GFO*). Ces documents, destinés à aider les ICN dans le cadre du processus de soumission d'une miniproposition, sont publiés en français, en anglais, en espagnol et en russe et se trouvent à l'adresse www.aidspan.org/aidspanpublications.)

Voici les sections principales du premier tome :

Chapitre 1 : Introduction et contexte
- Choisir de présenter ou non une demande de subvention
- L'importance de prendre une longueur d'avance

Chapitre 2 : Renseignements généraux
- Quels projets le Fonds mondial appuie-t-il?
- Y a-t-il des restrictions quant au montant du financement que les candidats peuvent demander?
- Qui peut soumettre une demande de subvention au Fonds mondial?
- Description du processus de soumission d'une demande de subvention
- Quels sont les critères d'évaluation des propositions?
- Soumettre ou non la proposition d'une instance hors ICN
- Soumettre ou non une proposition régionale
- Soumettre ou non la proposition d'une ICSN
- Directives sur le contenu technique des propositions

Chapitre 3 : Processus d'élaboration de la proposition
- L'importance d'établir un processus d'élaboration de la proposition
- Intégration à d'autres processus nationaux
- Entreprendre le processus d'élaboration de la proposition
- Éléments à prendre en compte relativement à chaque activité du processus
- Gestion du processus d'élaboration de la proposition
- Processus de sollicitation et d'examen des candidatures

Chapitre 4 : Leçons retenues des séries d'octrois de subventions antérieures
- Points forts
- Points faibles

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
7. NOTICIA: Se Acaban de Publicar las Versiones en Español y Francés de la *"Guía de Aidspan para las Propuestas al Fondo Mundial de la Ronda 8 - Volumen 1: Anticipando el Trabajo"*
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

[Editor's note: This article is an adaptation in Spanish of an article that appeared in English in GFO Issue #83.]

Se Acaban de Publicar las Versiones en Español y Francés de la *"La Guía de Aidspan para las Propuestas al Fondo Mundial de la Ronda 8 - Volumen 1: Anticipando el Trabajo (Primera Edición – Revisada)".* Las mismas están disponibles de manera gratuita en www.aidspan.org/guides, donde también podrá encontrar otras Guías de Aidspan.

El Volumen 1 contiene información y orientación para (a) ayudar a los solicitantes potenciales en la decisión sobre si preparar una propuesta para la Ronda 8; y, en caso que hayan decidió hacerlo, (b) asistir a los solicitantes en el proceso de desarrollo de la propuesta (incluyendo el proceso de solicitar subpropuestas nacionales para su posible inclusión en la propuesta nacional). El Volumen 1 también discute los factores que los potenciales solicitantes deben considerar si tienen planes de presentar una propuesta regional o fuera del MCP. Finalmente, el Volumen 1 incluye un análisis amplio de las

fortalezas y debilidades de las propuestas presentadas en anteriores rondas de financiamiento (basado en los comentarios del Panel de Revisión Técnica).

El Volumen 2 (a ser publicado tan pronto sea posible luego que la Ronda 8 sea oficialmente activada el primero de marzo del 2008) ofrecerá una orientación adicional sobre el proceso de solicitudes de la Ronda 8 y sobre como llenar el respectivo formulario de propuesta.

Aidspan ha venido produciendo guías practicas para cada nueva ronda de financiamiento, desde la Ronda 4. Esta es la primera vez que Aidspan produce su guía en dos volúmenes. Ese enfoque es consistente con la recomendación de Aidspan (y de otros) que los solicitantes deben comenzar a trabajar en sus propuestas con bastante anticipación a la llamada que realiza el Fondo Mundial. La información en el Volumen 1 sobre el proceso de desarrollo de la propuesta es mucho mas extensa de lo que ha incluido Aidspan en sus anteriores guías practicas.

(Los solicitantes podrían usar el Volumen 1 conjuntamente con los "Documentos de Aidspan para las Subpropuestas Nacionales" publicados en diciembre del 2007 (ver anuncio en el GFO #82). Esos documentos, que fueron diseñados para asistir a los MCPs en el proceso de las subpropuestas nacionales, están disponibles en ingles, francés, español y ruso en www.aidspan.org/aidspanpublications.)

Las secciones principales del Volumen 1 son las siguientes:

Capitulo 1: Introducción y Antecedentes
- Decida si va a Participar
- La importancia de la Anticipación

Capitulo 2: Información General
- ¿Cuáles Iniciativas Apoyará el Fondo Mundial?.
- ¿Existen Restricciones Sobre el Monto de Financiamiento que Pueden Pedir los Solicitantes?.
- ¿Quiénes son Elegibles para Presentar Propuestas al Fondo Mundial?.
- Descripción del Proceso de Presentación de Propuestas.
- ¿Cuáles son los Criterios Utilizados para Revisar las Propuestas?.
- Decida si va a Presentar una Propuesta fuera del MCP (MFD-MCP).
- Decida si va a Presentar una Propuesta Regional.
- Decida si va a Presentar una Propuesta Sub-MCP.
- Orientación en Relación al Contenido Técnico de las Propuestas **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Capitulo 3: El Proceso de Desarrollo de la Propuesta
- La Importancia de Establecer un Proceso de Desarrollo de la Propuesta.
- Integración con Otros Procesos Nacionales.
- Diseñando el Proceso de Desarrollo de la Propuesta.
- Temas a Considerar en Cada Acción del Proceso.
- Gestionando el Desarrollo de la Propuesta.
- Proceso para Solicitar y Revisar las Subpropuestas.

Capitulo 4: Lecciones Aprendidas de las Rondas Anteriores de Financiamiento
- Fortalezas
- Debilidades

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
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 7,000 subscribers in 170 countries at least twelve times per year.

GFO is a free service of Aidspan (www.aidspan.org), based in Nairobi, Kenya. Aidspan is a non-governmental 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, +254-20-445-4321)

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.