



Independent observer
of the Global Fund

Donors to the Global Fund: Who Gives How Much?

By Bernard Rivers

12 December 2012

P.O. Box 66869–00800, Nairobi, Kenya

TEL +254 (0) 774 135 984 EMAIL info@aidspan.org

www.aidspan.org

Table of Contents

Preface.....	3
1. Executive Summary.....	4
2. Introduction.....	5
3. Findings.....	6
3.1 The main donor groups.....	6
3.2 The top fifteen donors.....	6
3.3 Using “Global Fund donor scores” to show which countries have given the most (or the least) to the Global Fund relative to their national income.....	7
3.4 An important caveat regarding “Global Fund donor scores”.....	10
3.5 Donors that have not fully paid their pledges.....	10
Appendix – Detailed tables.....	13
Table 8: 2011–2013 pledges to the Global Fund by the 30 high-income countries with the largest economies, also showing bilateral spending on AIDS for 2011.....	14
Table 9: 2011–2013 pledges to the Global Fund by all donors other than the 30 high-income countries with the largest economies.....	15
Table 10: 2011–2013 pledges to the Global Fund by all donors, in descending order of pledge amount, also showing total contributions since 2001.....	16
Data sources.....	17
Endnotes for the tables in the Appendix.....	18

Preface

Aidspan (www.aidspan.org) is an international NGO based in Nairobi, Kenya, whose mission is to reinforce the effectiveness of the Global Fund. Aidspan performs this mission by serving as an independent watchdog of the Fund, and by providing services that can benefit all countries wishing to obtain and make effective use of Global Fund financing.

This report is one of many Aidspan guides and reports available at www.aidspan.org/page/guides-global-fund and www.aidspan.org/page/other-publications.

Reports recently published by Aidspan include:

- *Quantifying the Global Fund's Contribution to Saving Lives: Methodological and Policy Issues*
- *The Global Fund: What Next for Aid Effectiveness and Health Systems Strengthening?*
- *The Global Fund and Community Systems Strengthening: The Wrong Organisation for the Right Job? Or the Right Organisation Doing the Job Wrongly?*

Aidspan also publishes news, analysis and commentary articles about the Global Fund in its Global Fund Observer (GFO) newsletter and on GFO Live. To receive GFO Newsletter, send an email to receive-gfo-newsletter@aidspan.org. The subject line and text area can be left blank. To see articles on GFO Live, go to www.aidspan.org/page/gfo-live.

Aidspan finances its work primarily through grants from governments and foundations. Aidspan does not accept funding of any kind from the Global Fund.

Aidspan and the Global Fund maintain a positive working relationship, but have no formal connection. Aidspan does not allow its strategic, programmatic or editorial decision-making to be influenced by the Global Fund or by relationships with Aidspan's actual or potential funders. The Global Fund and Aidspan's funders bear no responsibility for the contents of any Aidspan publication.

Acknowledgements

Aidspan thanks the UK Department for International Development (DFID), the Ford Foundation, GIZ Backup Initiative, The Monument Trust, Norad and Hivos for the support they have provided for 2012–2015 operations.

Author: Bernard Rivers (bernard.rivers@gmail.com) founded Aidspan in 2002 and ran it until September 2012. He now serves as Aidspan's first Senior Fellow.

1. Executive Summary

The countries whose recent pledges to the Global Fund have been the largest in relation to their gross national income are Sweden, Norway, France, the United Kingdom and Canada, in that order.

To help with the analysis that led to this conclusion, Aidspace created a formula for a “Global Fund donor score.” The formula is based on a country’s average annual pledge to the Global Fund for 2011–2013 as a percentage of its 2011 gross national income. Aidspace then applied this formula to each of the 30 countries that have the largest economies and that are defined by the World Bank as being “high-income.” (The definition “high-income” is based on standard of living, not size of economy).

The countries with a Global Fund donor score of “A”, meaning that the percentage is greater than 0.010%, are the five mentioned above.

Those with a Global Fund donor score of “B” (percentage from 0.007% to 0.010%) are, in descending order, the United States, Denmark, the Netherlands, Germany and Australia. Those with a Global Fund donor score of “C” (percentage from 0.003% to 0.006%) are Belgium and Japan. Those with a Global Fund donor score of “D” (percentage from 0.001% to 0.002%) are Finland, Switzerland and Saudi Arabia. Those with a score of “E” (percentage below 0.001%) are Kuwait and South Korea. And those with a score of “F”, based on having pledged nothing to the Fund for 2011–2013, are Austria, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Singapore, Spain and United Arab Emirates.

It is important to note that these Global Fund donor scores are based only on direct pledges to the Global Fund. Some countries also contribute indirectly, via the European Commission or UNITAID or Debt2Health. Some countries also donate considerable amounts of money for non-Global Fund programmes to fight AIDS, TB and malaria (such as through bilateral aid). Others don’t give much money for the three diseases, but may give to other charitable or development causes.

Based solely on the size of the pledges, and looking now at all donors to the Global Fund, not just the 30 largest economies, the biggest pledges for 2011–2013 were made, in decreasing order, by the United States, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan, Canada, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the European Commission, Sweden, Norway, Australia, Netherlands, Denmark, Russia and Belgium.

During the years 2001–2005, every pledge made to the Global Fund was fully paid. Since then this has not been the case: a total of \$645 million in pledges made to the Global Fund for the years 2006–2011 has not yet been paid.

The private sector provided only 0.3% of total pledges for 2011–2013 (about \$10 million annually). However, this does not include (Product) RED, an alliance of various private sector companies, which, without making pledges, contributes about \$20 million annually.

2. Introduction

In April 2001, the then United Nations Secretary General, Kofi Annan, declared that there should be a “war chest” of \$7 billion to \$10 billion to finance the fight against AIDS, and proposed that much of this should be raised, and then disbursed, by a "Global Fund."

Within less than a year, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria went from concept to reality. The Global Fund opened its doors in January 2002, and since then has raised nearly \$25 billion, which has been used to save millions of lives.

Every third year, as part of the Global Fund’s “replenishment” process, most donors to the Fund meet and agree how much money each of them will give to the Fund over the subsequent three years. This last happened in 2010, when donors made their pledges for the years 2011–2013, which constitute the current replenishment period. In March and October 2013, donors will again meet, this time to make their pledges for the next replenishment period, 2014–2016.

The pledges are the amounts promised; the contributions are the amounts actually given. The pledges that donors make to the Global Fund are not legally binding, but they are generally regarded as being morally binding. There is nothing to prevent a donor from contributing more than it has pledged, and that sometimes happens.

3. Findings

3.1 The main donor groups

As shown in Table 1, below, 90% of the pledges to the Global Fund for 2011–2013 were made by the 30 high-income countries with the largest economies. (“High-income countries” are the countries deemed by the World Bank to have the highest standard of living. Some countries, like China and Russia, have very large national incomes, but are not high-income countries.) Another 4% of the pledges to the Global Fund came from the European Commission, which receives that money from European countries.

Just over 4% of the pledges came from foundations and other charitable donors, with virtually all of that being provided by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

A very low 0.3% of the pledges (about \$10 million annually) came from the private sector (Anglo American plc, Chevron Corporation, and Takeda Pharmaceutical). However, separately, (Product) RED, an alliance of various private sector companies, contributes about \$20 million annually. The contributions from (Product) RED are not shown in Table 1 because they are not pledged in advance – the alliance contributes money as it is raised by and from its member companies.

Table 1: Pledges to the Global Fund for 2011–2013 made by the main donor groups

Donor group	Pledges to the Global Fund	
	Average annual pledge by each entire group 2011–2013, \$m.	As % of all pledges to Global Fund
The 30 high-income countries with the largest economies *	3,171.8	90.0%
Other countries that have given to the Global Fund	34.1	1.0%
European Commission	140.9	4.0%
Foundations and other charitable donors	152.9	4.3%
Private sector	10.5	0.3%
Other	13.8	0.4%
GRAND TOTAL	3,523.8	100.0%

This table is based on Tables 8 and 9 in the Appendix.

* “High-income” countries are further defined in the notes to Table 3.

3.2 The top fifteen donors

The largest pledges for 2011–2013 were made, in decreasing order, by the United States, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan, Canada, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the European Commission, Sweden, Norway, Australia, Netherlands, Denmark, Russia and Belgium. The amounts these donors have pledged, and the total amounts they

have given since the start of the Global Fund, are shown in Table 2, below. Table 10, in the Appendix, provides a complete list of all donors, using the same format.

Table 2: The top fifteen 2011–2013 pledges to the Global Fund, in descending order of pledge amount, also showing total contributions since 2001

Donor	Pledge to the Global Fund			Total contributions to Global Fund since 2001, \$m.
	Average annual pledge 2011–2013, \$m.	As % of all pledges to Global Fund	Rank	
The top 15 pledges to the Global Fund:				
United States *	1,333.3	37.8%	1	7,285.5
France	477.7	13.6%	2	3,066.3
United Kingdom	340.0	9.6%	3	1,874.5
Germany	263.4	7.5%	4	1,654.8
Japan	200.0	5.7%	5	1,618.2
Canada	179.0	5.1%	6	1,060.8
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	150.0	4.3%	7	950.0
European Commission	140.9	4.0%	8	1,413.5
Sweden	99.1	2.8%	9	629.3
Norway	76.5	2.2%	10	503.4
Australia	72.7	2.1%	11	213.2
Netherlands	63.5	1.8%	12	739.0
Denmark	27.0	0.8%	13	240.7
Russia	20.0	0.6%	14	297.0
Belgium	18.0	0.5%	15	156.2
SUBTOTAL	3,461.1	98.4%		21,702.4
Remaining pledges to the Global Fund	62.7	1.6%		370.1
TOTAL	3,523.8	100.0%		22,072.5
Donors that have not pledged for 2011–2013 (see Table 4, below)	0.0	0.0%		2,219.0
GRAND TOTAL	3,523.8	100.0%		24,291.5

This table is based on Table 10 in the Appendix.

* US legislation does not permit the US's cumulative contribution since 2004 ever to be more than 33.3% of the cumulative contributions from all donors. If other donors do not increase their 2011–2013 pledges, this could cause the US not to contribute its full 2011–2013 pledge as shown in this table.

3.3 Using “Global Fund donor scores” to show which countries have given the most (or the least) to the Global Fund relative to their national income

If a country pledges to give, say, \$100 million annually to the Global Fund, this is clearly a much more significant act if the country has a small economy than if it has a large one. Accordingly, Aidspan has calculated, for the 30 high-income countries with the largest economies, each country's “Global Fund donor score,” ranging from A to F. As shown in Table 3, below, the score is based on each country's average annual pledge to the Global Fund during 2011–2013 as a percentage of that country's 2011 gross national income (GNI). The higher that percentage is, the higher the score.

Table 3: The “Global Fund donor score” of the 30 high-income countries⁺ with the largest economies, based on pledges for 2011–2013

Global Fund donor score **	Donor ⁺⁺	Pledge to the Global Fund	
		Average annual pledge 2011–2013, \$m.	As % of GNI [*]
A	Sweden	99.1	0.0197%
	Norway	76.5	0.0174%
	France	477.7	0.0172%
	United Kingdom	340.0	0.0144%
	Canada	179.0	0.0114%
B	United States	1,333.3	0.0088%
	Denmark	27.0	0.0080%
	Netherlands	63.5	0.0076%
	Germany	263.4	0.0073%
	Australia	72.7	0.0071%
C	Belgium	18.0	0.0035%
	Japan	200.0	0.0035%
D	Finland	5.2	0.0020%
	Switzerland	8.3	0.0014%
	Saudi Arabia	5.6	0.0011%
E	Kuwait	0.5	0.0004%
	South Korea	2.0	0.0002%
F	Austria, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Singapore, Spain, United Arab Emirates	0.0 each	0%

This table is based on Table 8 in the Appendix, which includes some endnotes regarding specific countries.

- ⁺ The World Bank defines 70 countries as being “high-income.” This is a measure of standard of living. This table deals with the 30 independent nations from that list that have the highest gross national income (GNI).
- ⁺⁺ This table does not reflect pledges to the Global Fund made by the European Commission (EC), which are all paid from contributions made to the EC by European Union member states. As shown in Tables 1 and 2, the average annual EC pledge to the Fund during 2011–2013 was \$140.9 m.
- ^{*} This column shows each country’s average annual pledge to the Fund during 2011–2013 as a percentage of its 2011 GNI.
- ^{**} The term “Global Fund donor score” was invented by Aidsplan, and is defined as follows:
- Global Fund donor score “A”: Average annual pledge to the Global Fund during 2011-2013 as a % of 2011 GNI is greater than 0.010%
 - Global Fund donor score “B”: % is from 0.007% to 0.010%
 - Global Fund donor score “C”: % is from 0.003% to 0.006%
 - Global Fund donor score “D”: % is from 0.001% to 0.002%
 - Global Fund donor score “E”: % is below 0.001%
 - Global Fund donor score “F”: % is zero

As shown in Table 3, above, the 30 countries fall fairly clearly into six groups. Those to whom Aidsplan has assigned a “Global Fund donor score” of “A” are Sweden, Norway, France, the UK and Canada. Those to whom Aidsplan has assigned a Global Fund donor score of “E” are Kuwait and South Korea. And lowest of all, assigned a Global Fund donor score of “F”, are the countries that have not made any pledges to the Global Fund for 2011–2013, namely, in alphabetical order, Austria, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Singapore, Spain and United Arab Emirates.

A more complete analysis of the non-pledgers for 2011–2013 is shown in Table 4, below. Three countries – Italy, Spain and Ireland – that pledged substantially to the Global Fund for years prior to 2011 pledged nothing for 2011–2013 because of their domestic economic difficulties, and each of them failed to fully cover its pledge for at least one year before 2011. However, during 2011–2012, Ireland did make some contributions to cover part of the unpaid portion of its 2010 pledge, and there are signs that Spain may again become a donor to the Fund.

Table 4: Global Fund donors that have not pledged to the Fund for 2011–2013

Donor	Total contributions to Global Fund since 2001, \$m.
Donors that have not pledged for 2011–2013, but that contributed before 2011:	
Italy	1,008.3
Spain	724.2
Ireland *	184.8
UNITAID	38.7
Idol Gives Back	16.6
Portugal	15.5
India	10.0
Other donors	9.5
New Zealand	2.8
Greece	2.2
Communitas Foundation	2.0
Uganda	1.5
Iceland	1.1
Singapore	1.0
Brazil, Hungary, Latvia, Mexico, Poland, Slovenia, Hottokenai Campaign	Each at 0.3 or less
Total	2,019.4
Donor that does not make pledges, but that has given to the Global Fund every year since 2006:	
(Product) RED and partners: American Express, Apple, Bugaboo International, Converse, Dell + Windows, GAP, Giorgio Armani, Hallmark, Motorola Foundation, Motorola Inc. & Partners, Starbucks Coffee, Media Partners and (RED) Supporters	199.6
Total contributions from donors who have not pledged for 2011–2013	2,219.0

* See endnote 6 on page 18.

As shown in Table 5, below, five of the non-pledgers are countries that, despite being among the thirty high-income countries with the largest economies, have never pledged or given anything to the Global Fund.

Table 5: Countries that are from the 30 high-income countries with the largest economies but that have never pledged or given to the Global Fund

Austria
Czech Republic
Israel
Qatar
United Arab Emirates

3.4 An important caveat regarding “Global Fund donor scores”

It is important to note that the Global Fund donor scores shown in Tables 3 and 8 are based only on direct pledges to the Global Fund. Some of the countries listed also contribute indirectly, via the European Commission or UNITAID or Debt2Health. Some also donate considerable amounts of money for non-Global Fund programmes to fight AIDS, TB and malaria (such as through bilateral aid). Others don’t give much money for the three diseases, but may give to other charitable or development causes.

In assigning Global Fund donor scores, we are not taking account of these other forms of giving – though in Table 8, in the Appendix, we do provide some information, in the last column, on how much money some countries have spent on their own bilateral programmes to tackle AIDS. (We were not able to obtain such data for all 30 countries; nor were we able to obtain data on bilateral spending on TB and malaria.)

3.5 Donors that have not fully paid their pledges

During the years 2001–2005, every pledge made to the Global Fund was fully paid. This has not been the case since then. As shown in Table 6, below, \$645 million in pledges made to the Global Fund for the years 2006–2011 has not yet been paid.

As shown in Table 7, below, a further \$1,444 million in pledges for 2012 had not been paid as of 28 November 2012. However, it can be assumed that many of the 2012 amounts will be paid during December 2012.

Table 6: Donors that have not fully paid their pledges to the Global Fund for years before 2012

Donor	Unpaid amount, in \$m. (and as % of that country's pledge to the Global Fund)							Total 2001–2011 *
	2001-2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	
Cameroon	0	0	0.025 (100.0%)	0	0	0	0	0.025 (100.0%)
France **	0	0	32.3 (7.7%)	0	0	0	43.3 (8.6%)	75.7 (2.6%)
India	0	0	0	0	0	1.0 (33.3%)	0	1.0 (9.1%)
Ireland +	0	0	0	0		8.8 (19.8%)	0	8.8 (4.5%)
Italy	0	0	0	0	168.2 (100.0%)	168.2 (100.0%)	0	336.3 (25.3%)
Monaco	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.052 (100.0%)	0.052 (28.2%)
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	17.6 (14.9%)	0	17.6 (2.4%)
Nigeria	0	0.037 (0.4%)	0	0	0	0	10.0 (100.0%)	10.0 (34.6%)
South Africa	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.7 (100.0%)	1.7 (14.4%)
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	116.3 (46.5%)	0	116.3 (14.0%)
Uganda	0	0	0.5 (100.0%)	0	0	0	0	0.5 (25.0%)
United States **	0	0	0	0	0	0	57.6 (5.5%)	57.6 (0.9%)
European Commission ***	0	0	0	0	0	0	19.4 (11.7%)	19.4 (1.4%)
Gift From Africa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3 (30.7%)	0.3 (30.7%)
Total \$m. (and as % of pledges from all donors)	0	0.037 (0.0%)	32.9 (1.2%)	0	168.2 (5.2%)	311.9 (9.0%)	132.4 (4.2%)	645.3 (2.9%)

* The percentage shown in this column is the sum of all unpaid amounts by a country as a percentage of all pledges by that country to the Global Fund.

** The unpaid amount shown for France for 2011 is based on what is shown at the Global Fund website. A representative of the government of France wrote to Aidsplan stating that in fact there was no French unpaid amount in 2011, and that the Global Fund website data does not correctly deal with a portion of the French pledge that was, by prior agreement, held back under France's "5% initiative" to cover technical support to certain Global Fund grant implementers. (The representative did not comment on the unpaid amount by France shown for 2007.)

+ See endnote 6 on page 18.

** The unpaid amount shown for the United States for 2011 relates to Congressionally mandated withholding requirements. Some of those withholdings are to cover technical support to Global Fund grant implementers.

*** The unpaid amount shown for the European Commission for 2011 is based on what is shown at the Global Fund website. A representative of the European Commission wrote to Aidsplan stating that for administrative reasons this unpaid amount will be paid not in 2011 but in early 2014, and that this delay "was planned from the beginning and is contained in the [EC's] contractual arrangements with the Global Fund." He added that "the European Commission has always paid up all its pledges and will continue to do so in the future."

Table 7: Donors that have not fully paid their pledges to the Global Fund for 2012

Donor	2012 unpaid amount as of 28 November 2012	
	In \$m.	As % of the country's 2012 pledge to the Global Fund
Australia	72.5	100.0%
Belgium	27.2	100.0%
Canada	139.9	77.5%
Denmark	25.1	100.0%
France	271.6	58.3%
Germany	129.3	50.0%
Japan	123.9	36.4%
Korea (Republic of)	2.0	100.0%
Kuwait	0.5	100.0%
Liechtenstein	0.1	100.0%
Monaco	0.1	100.0%
Namibia	0.1	47.6%
Saudi Arabia	8.3	100.0%
Sweden	105.1	100.0%
United States	462.9	35.6%
European Commission	64.7	51.0%
Debt2Health: Germany	1.1	78.9%
Anglo American plc.	1.0	100.0%
Chevron Corporation	8.0	100.0%
Gift From Africa	0.8	82.5%
Total \$m. (and as % of pledges from all donors)	1,444.3	39.6%

Important note: This table shows unpaid pledges for 2012 as of 28 November 2012. It can be assumed that many of the countries shown will pay the unpaid amounts in the course of December 2012, thereby putting them fully in compliance with their 2012 pledges.

Appendix – Detailed tables

Most of the tables in the report are based on the information contained in the tables on the following three pages.

Table 8: 2011–2013 pledges to the Global Fund by the 30 high-income countries with the largest economies, also showing bilateral spending on AIDS for 2011

Donor ¹ (See page 18 for endnotes)	Pledge to the Global Fund				Bilateral spending on AIDS, 2011, \$m.
	Average annual pledge 2011–2013, \$m.	As % of all pledges to Global Fund	As % of GNI *	Global Fund donor score **	
The 30 high-income⁺ countries with the largest economies:					
Australia ²	72.7	2.1%	0.0071%	B	87.4
Austria	0.0	0.0%	0%	F	n/a
Belgium	18.0	0.5%	0.0035%	C	n/a
Canada ³	179.0	5.1%	0.0114%	A	57.6
Czech Republic	0.0	0.0%	0%	F	n/a
Denmark	27.0	0.8%	0.0080%	B	172.3
Finland	5.2	0.1%	0.0020%	D	n/a
France ⁴	477.7	13.6%	0.0172%	A	81.3
Germany ⁵	263.4	7.5%	0.0073%	B	150.8
Greece	0.0	0.0%	0%	F	n/a
Hungary	0.0	0.0%	0%	F	n/a
Ireland ⁶	0.0	0.0%	0%	F	69.4
Israel	0.0	0.0%	0%	F	n/a
Italy	0.0	0.0%	0%	F	5.1
Japan	200.0	5.7%	0.0035%	C	20.9
South Korea ⁷	2.0	0.1%	0.0002%	E	n/a
Kuwait	0.5	0.0%	0.0004%	E	n/a
Netherlands	63.5	1.8%	0.0076%	B	272.8
Norway ⁸	76.5	2.2%	0.0174%	A	66.9
Poland	0.0	0.0%	0%	F	n/a
Portugal	0.0	0.0%	0%	F	n/a
Qatar	0.0	0.0%	0%	F	n/a
Saudi Arabia	5.6	0.2%	0.0011%	D	n/a
Singapore	0.0	0.0%	0%	F	n/a
Spain	0.0	0.0%	0%	F	n/a
Sweden	99.1	2.8%	0.0197%	A	115.2
Switzerland	8.3	0.2%	0.0014%	D	n/a
United Arab Emirates	0.0	0.0%	0%	F	n/a
United Kingdom ^{9 10 11}	340.0	9.6%	0.0144%	A	680.5
United States ¹²	1,333.3	37.8%	0.0088%	B	3,974.8
TOTAL	3,171.8	90.0%			
All other donors (as shown in Table 9, below)	352.2	10.0%			
GRAND TOTAL	3,523.8	100.0%			

⁺ The World Bank defines 70 countries as being “high-income.” This is a measure of standard of living, not of GNI. This table deals with the 30 independent nations from that list that have the highest GNI.

^{*} Each country’s average annual pledge to the Fund during 2011–2013 as a % of its 2011 gross national income

^{**} The term “Global Fund donor score” was invented by Aidspan, and is defined as follows:

- *Global Fund donor score “A”*: Average annual pledge to the Global Fund during 2011-2013 as a % of 2011 Gross National Income (GNI) is greater than 0.010%
- *Global Fund donor score “B”*: % is from 0.007% to 0.010%
- *Global Fund donor score “C”*: % is from 0.003% to 0.006%
- *Global Fund donor score “D”*: % is from 0.001% to 0.002%
- *Global Fund donor score “E”*: % is below 0.001%
- *Global Fund donor score “F”*: % is zero

n/a = not available

Table 9: 2011–2013 pledges to the Global Fund by all donors other than the 30 high-income countries with the largest economies

Donor	Pledge to the Global Fund	
	Average annual pledge 2011–2013, \$m.	As % of all pledges to Global Fund
Other countries that have given to the Fund:		
Brunei Darussalam	< 0.1	0.0%
China	4.7	0.1%
Georgia	< 0.1	0.0%
Liechtenstein	0.1	0.0%
Luxembourg ¹³	3.3	0.1%
Malaysia	< 0.1	0.0%
Monaco	0.1	0.0%
Namibia	0.3	0.0%
Nigeria	3.3	0.1%
Romania	< 0.1	0.0%
Russia	20.0	0.6%
Rwanda	0.3	0.0%
South Africa	0.6	0.0%
Thailand	0.7	0.0%
Tunisia	0.7	0.0%
TOTAL	34.1	1.0%
European Commission ¹⁴	140.9	4.0%
Foundations and other charitable donors:		
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation ¹⁵	150.0	4.3%
Comic Relief	0.1	0.0%
Gift From Africa	1.0	0.0%
M·A·C AIDS Fund	0.2	0.0%
Lutheran Malaria Initiative	0.3	0.0%
United Methodist Church	1.3	0.0%
TOTAL	152.9	4.3%
Private sector:		
Anglo American plc.	1.0	0.0%
Chevron Corporation	8.3	0.2%
Takeda Pharmaceutical	1.2	0.0%
TOTAL	10.5	0.3%
Other:		
Debt2Health: Australia	2.0	0.1%
Debt2Health: Germany	11.8	0.3%
Exchange-Traded Funds	< 0.1	0.0%
TOTAL	13.8	0.4%
Total for this table	352.2	10.0%

Table 10: 2011–2013 pledges to the Global Fund by all donors, in descending order of pledge amount, also showing total contributions since 2001

(Note: Columns 1-3 repeat data from Table 8)

Donor	Pledge to the Global Fund			Total contributions to Global Fund since 2001, \$m.
	Average annual pledge 2011–2013, \$m.	As % of all pledges to Global Fund	Rank	
United States	1,333.3	37.8%	1	7,285.5
France	477.7	13.6%	2	3,066.3
United Kingdom	340.0	9.6%	3	1,874.5
Germany	263.4	7.5%	4	1,654.8
Japan	200.0	5.7%	5	1,618.2
Canada	179.0	5.1%	6	1,060.8
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	150.0	4.3%	7	950.0
European Commission	140.9	4.0%	8	1,413.5
Sweden	99.1	2.8%	9	629.3
Norway	76.5	2.2%	10	503.4
Australia	72.7	2.1%	11	213.2
Netherlands	63.5	1.8%	12	739.0
Denmark	27.0	0.8%	13	240.7
Russia	20.0	0.6%	14	297.0
Belgium	18.0	0.5%	15	156.2
Debt2Health: Germany	11.8	0.3%	16	67.9
Switzerland	8.3	0.2%	17	64.4
Chevron Corporation	8.3	0.2%	18	38.0
Saudi Arabia	5.6	0.2%	19	28.0
Finland	5.2	0.1%	20	30.6
China	4.7	0.1%	21	25.0
Luxembourg	3.3	0.1%	22	30.7
Nigeria	3.3	0.1%	23	19.0
South Korea	2.0	0.1%	24	15.0
Debt2Health: Australia	2.0	0.1%	25	7.9
United Methodist Church	1.3	0.0%	26	3.8
Takeda Pharmaceutical	1.2	0.0%	27	3.4
Anglo American plc.	1.0	0.0%	28	1.0
Gift From Africa	1.0	0.0%	29	0.9
Thailand	0.7	0.0%	30	10.0
Tunisia	0.7	0.0%	31	2.0
South Africa	0.6	0.0%	32	10.3
Kuwait	0.5	0.0%	33	3.5
Lutheran Malaria Initiative	0.3	0.0%	34	0.8
Rwanda	0.3	0.0%	35	0.7
Namibia	0.3	0.0%	36	0.4
M·A·C AIDS Fund	0.2	0.0%	37	1.4
Comic Relief	0.1	0.0%	38	3.3
Liechtenstein	0.1	0.0%	39	0.9
Monaco	0.1	0.0%	40	0.1
Romania	< 0.1	0.0%	41	0.8
Brunei Darussalam; Georgia; Malaysia; Exchange-Traded Funds	< 0.1 each	0.0%	42 =	< 0.2 each
Donors that have not pledged for 2011-2013 (as listed in Table 4, above)	0.0	0.0%		2,219.0
GRAND TOTAL	3,523.8	100.0%		24,291.5

Data sources

1. All data regarding pledges and contributions to the Global Fund and to AMFm were obtained from a spreadsheet that was downloaded from the Global Fund website on 3 December 2012. That file had last been updated by the Global Fund on 28 November 2012. A copy of the file is available [here](#). From time to time, the Global Fund will place an updated version at www.theglobalfund.org/documents/core/financial/Core_PledgesContributions_List_en/.
2. Data regarding Gross National Income (GNI) were obtained on 4 December 2012 from <http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/GNI-Atlas-method-table>. Data regarding which countries are defined as “high-income” were obtained on 27 November 2012 from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/CLASS.XLS>.
3. Data in the final column of Table 8 re bilateral spending on AIDS in 2011 were taken from the July 2012 Kaiser Family Foundation (KFF) report “Financing the Response to AIDS in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: International Assistance from Donor Governments in 2011,” available at www.kff.org/hivaids/upload/7347-08.pdf, with an update regarding Canada taken from the ONE Data Report “The Beginning of the End? Tracking Global Commitments on AIDS” (November 2012), available at www.one.org/international/actnow/beginning.
4. Data regarding donations to UNITAID were obtained from the 2011 UNITAID Annual Report, available at www.unitaid.eu/images/Annual_Report_2011/UNITAID_AR2011_EN.pdf.

Endnotes for the tables in the Appendix

- ¹ This table deals with pledges made directly to the Global Fund. European Union member states that are shown in this table also made pledges and contributions indirectly to the Global Fund in that they made payments to the European Commission (through the EU budget and the European Development Fund), and some of that money was then paid by the European Commission to the Global Fund, as is shown in Tables 1 and 2.
- ² Australia also contributed to the Global Fund through the Debt2Health programme (see Table 9).
- ³ In 2012, Canada also gave \$20.0 m. to AMFm, a programme managed by the Global Fund.
- ⁴ In 2011, France also gave \$144.3 m. to UNITAID; some of that money was then given to the Global Fund.
- ⁵ Germany also contributed to the Global Fund through the Debt2Health programme (see Table 9).
- ⁶ Owing to its domestic economic difficulties, Ireland did not fully pay its pledge for 2010 during that year, and did not make any pledges regarding 2011–2013. However, a representative of the government of Ireland wrote to Aidspan stating that during 2011–2012 Ireland contributed \$27.35 m. towards the unpaid part of its 2010 pledge. (This reduced the unpaid part of that pledge to \$8.81 m.)
- ⁷ In 2011, South Korea also gave \$7.0 m. to UNITAID; some of that money was then given to the Global Fund.
- ⁸ In 2011, Norway also gave \$18.8 m. to UNITAID; some of that money was then given to the Global Fund.
- ⁹ The UK has not officially made a pledge for 2013, but it has made a pledge of \$376.8 m. for a “period to be confirmed” which the Global Fund, in a footnote to its pledge table, appears to regard as being for 2013.
- ¹⁰ In 2012, the UK also gave \$50.4 m. to AMFm, a programme managed by the Global Fund.
- ¹¹ In 2011, the UK also gave \$85.1 m. to UNITAID; some of that money was then given to the Global Fund.
- ¹² The United States contribution to the Global Fund is subject to appropriation and certain US legislative restrictions, including that no US government contribution may cause the total amount of US government funds contributed to exceed 33% of total contributions. Furthermore, up to 5% of this funding may be applied in the form of direct bilateral technical assistance to activities related to Global Fund grant implementation, and the contribution to the Global Fund reduced correspondingly.
- ¹³ In 2011, Luxembourg also gave \$0.6 m. to UNITAID; some of that money was then given to the Global Fund.
- ¹⁴ The pledges and contributions made to the Global Fund by the EC are all derived from payments made to the EC by European Union member states. See also endnote 1.
- ¹⁵ In 2011, the Gates Foundation also gave \$10.0 m. to UNITAID; some of that money was then given to the Global Fund.