

An Advocacy Guide on Global Fund Financing

International Council of AIDS Service
Organizations (ICASO)
&
Aidspan

JUNE 2005



ICASO

International
Council of
AIDS
Service
Organizations



An independent watchdog and supporter of the Global Fund
and publisher of *Global Fund Observer*

An Advocacy Guide on Global Fund Financing

Writer:
David Garmaise

Co-published by:
International Council of AIDS Service Organizations (ICASO)
&
Aidspan

June 2005

ICASO works to strengthen the community-based response to HIV/AIDS by connecting and representing NGOs throughout the world. Founded in 1991, ICASO operates from Regional Secretariats based on five continents, guided by the ICASO Secretariat in Toronto, Canada.

Aidspan, publisher of *Global Fund Observer*, is a small independent NGO whose mission is to monitor and reinforce the effectiveness of the *Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria* by serving as an independent watchdog of the Global Fund; supporting those who apply for and receive grants from the Fund; and supporting those who advocate for increased donations to the Fund.

Copies of this Advocacy Guide are available in English, French, Spanish and Russian via www.icaso.org and www.aidspan.org/guides.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 – Introduction	1
Chapter 2 – Setting the Context: Global Financing for HIV/AIDS.....	2
Chapter 3 – Funding for the Global Fund: Meeting Current and Future Needs	5
Chapter 4 – Advocacy Strategies for NGOs in Developing Countries.....	9
Chapter 5 – Advocacy Strategies for NGOs in Developed Countries	11
Chapter 6 - Resources	12
Appendix: Two Possible Contribution Scenarios	13

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Significant additional resources have been devoted to HIV/AIDS over the last few years, but there is still a long way to go. In 2004, spending on HIV/AIDS in low and middle income countries was estimated at \$6.1 billion.* Conservative projections indicate that by 2007 spending in these countries needs to more than double just to achieve 71 percent of prevention coverage targets and 54 percent of antiretroviral (ARV) targets.

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the Global Fund) is a major funder of HIV/AIDS programming in developing countries. The Global Fund is likely to experience a shortfall in its resource needs for the period 2005 to 2007 unless action is taken immediately to address the problem.

The purpose of *An Advocacy Guide on Global Fund Financing* is to provide advocates and activists in both developing and developed countries with (a) information on the current situation with respect to funding; and (b) suggested advocacy strategies to counter the anticipated shortfall.

Advocacy is obviously needed to ensure that donor governments increase their contributions to the Global Fund. But advocacy is also needed to ensure that projects financed by the Fund are successfully implemented, because unsuccessful projects will reflect badly on the Fund and may make donors hesitant to contribute additional resources.

Contents of the Guide

Chapter 2 describes the current state of global financing for HIV/AIDS, and situates this within the broader framework of development assistance. It provides some estimates on future resource needs for HIV/AIDS. Finally, the chapter discusses how the Global Fund fits into the funding picture, and describes some initiatives that have recently been launched to improve both forecasting and the coordination of international resources.

Chapter 3 focuses on the financing of the Global Fund itself. It identifies the resources that the Fund says it will need for 2006 and 2007; and it describes two possible scenarios for determining how much each donor country should contribute.

Chapter 4 outlines strategies that advocates and activists in developing countries can adopt or adapt to help ensure that Global Fund-financed projects are successfully implemented; and to bring pressure to bear on donor country governments to increase their contributions to the Fund. Chapter 5 advances strategies that advocates and activists in developed countries can follow to pressure their governments to increase contributions to the Global Fund.

Finally, the Appendix provides a more detailed version of the two contribution scenarios described in Chapter 3, and some discussion of these scenarios.

* All money amounts shown in this guide are in US dollars.

Chapter 2 – Setting the Context: Global Financing for HIV/AIDS

Because HIV/AIDS is so much more than a health issue, the fight against the disease needs to be seen in a much larger context. That context includes efforts to improve health, to eradicate poverty and hunger, to improve access to education, and to promote gender equality.

The Millennium Development Goals

In September 2000, the member states of the United Nations adopted the United Nations Millennium Declaration, commonly known as the Millennium Development Goals (MDG).

The

MDGs consist of eight goals, 18 targets and 48 indicators. The MDGs call for halving the number of people who live on less than one dollar a day; finding solutions to hunger, malnutrition and disease; promoting gender equality and the empowerment of women; guaranteeing a basic education for everyone; and supporting sustainable development. The Declaration calls for the provision of direct support from the richer countries, in the form of aid, trade, debt relief and investment, to help the developing countries. Most of the goals and targets are to be implemented by 2015.

THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS	SOME MDG TARGETS
1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger.	Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day.
2. Achieve universal primary education.	Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.
3. Promote gender equality and empower women.	Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling,
4. Reduce child mortality.	Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015.
5. Improve maternal health.	Reduce by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate.
6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases.	Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio.
7. Ensure environmental sustainability.	Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS, and the incidence of malaria and other diseases.
8. Develop a global partnership for development.	Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and sanitation. In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries.

Funding for HIV/AIDS

It is estimated that in 2004, spending on HIV/AIDS interventions in 135 low and middle income countries reached \$6.1 billion. This includes contributions from domestic governments, foreign donors and out-of-pocket expenditures. This is a significant improvement over 2001 spending levels of \$2.1 billion, but still far below what is needed.

Over the years, there have been several exercises undertaken to estimate what the actual needs are. Estimates of funding required for 2007 have ranged from \$10.0 billion to \$19.9 billion. In February 2005, the UNAIDS Reference Group on Economics (URGE) prepared a projection of the needs for 2007 using three different scenarios. URGE said that its “middle-of-the-road” scenario would require an investment of \$14.1 billion in 2007, and would result in 71 percent of prevention coverage targets and 54 percent of ARV targets being achieved. The \$14.1 billion projection was criticized by many people as being too conservative.

Work on refining these estimates is continuing.

The various projections developed to date cover anticipated needs in the areas of prevention, treatment, care and support, policy development, advocacy, operational research, administration, and monitoring and evaluation. They do not cover most HIV/AIDS-related basic and clinical research.

It is also important to note that the projections do not include the costs of strengthening in-country infrastructure in order to improve the capacity of countries to implement programs funded through these increased resources.

Even if one were to accept the \$14.1 billion projection as being adequate, **FUNDING FOR HIV/AIDS WILL NEED TO MORE THAN DOUBLE BETWEEN 2004 AND 2007 (FROM \$6.1 BILLION TO \$14.1 BILLION).**

Beyond 2007, it is clear that costs will continue to increase before the spread of the epidemic can be halted and reversed.

Where Does the Global Fund Fit In?

Sources of funding for HIV/AIDS are both domestic and international. Domestic spending comes primarily from governments, insurance companies and private citizens (out-of-pocket expenditures). International sources include multilateral institutions, bilateral donor agencies[†] and private foundations. Commercial businesses play a small role, both domestically and internationally.

The Global Fund is a multilateral donor. (The other major multilateral donor is the World Bank.) Funding for the Global Fund has come almost exclusively from donor countries (i.e., rich countries primarily from the North).

The Global Fund is a very significant player. The Fund itself estimates that it provides at least 20 percent of international funding for HIV/AIDS.¹ This share will likely increase in the future as the Global Fund proves itself as a financing mechanism that achieves results at country level.

“ The Global Fund is only part of a global effort to build and support a sustainable framework that effectively fuels progress towards achievement of the MDGs. The Global Fund can only succeed in making significant contributions to achieving these goals if its partners are also supported in their needs.”

– *Addressing HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis: Resource Needs of the Global Fund, 2005-2007*

Recent Developments

In March 2005, a UNAIDS-led “Resource Needs Steering Committee” was established to provide guidance to the UNAIDS Secretariat for its ongoing work on estimating resource needs for HIV/AIDS.

At the same time, a “Global Task Team on Improving AIDS Coordination among Multilateral Institutions and International Donors” was established by UNAIDS to develop a set of recommendations on improving the institutional architecture of the response to HIV and AIDS. The particular focus of the Task Team is on how the multilateral system can streamline, simplify and further harmonize procedures and practices in order to (a) improve the effectiveness of country-led responses and (b) reduce the burden placed on countries.

[†] Examples of bilateral donors are the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), and the U.S. President’s Emergency Plan for HIV/AIDS (PEPFAR). Because bilateral agencies are government entities, the terms “bilateral donor agencies” and “donor countries” are often used interchangeably.

Chapter 3 – Funding for the Global Fund: Meeting Current and Future Needs

In its first four rounds of funding, from 2002 to 2004, the Global Fund approved 296 proposals from 128 countries and three territories, involving expenditures of US\$3.1 billion over two years. Of this amount, 56 percent was for HIV/AIDS, 31 percent for malaria and 13 percent for tuberculosis.

Projected Needs

For 2005, the Global Fund estimates that it needs \$2.3 billion to fund new proposals approved in the fifth round of funding and to renew grants approved in earlier rounds.² Pledges for 2005, as of the beginning of May 2005, totalled \$1.6 billion. **THIS LEAVES A GAP OF \$700 MILLION FOR 2005.**

Based on its experience with the first four rounds of funding, estimates for renewal of approved grants, and estimates for new funding rounds, the Global Fund projects that it will need \$3.5 billion for 2006 and \$3.6 billion for 2007 (excluding operating expenses).[‡] As of 22 May 2005, pledges for 2006 and 2007 stood at \$0.7 billion and \$0.4 billion respectively. **THIS LEAVES A GAP OF \$2.8 BILLION FOR 2006 AND \$3.2 BILLION FOR 2007.**

FUNDING GAPS			
Year	Projected needs	Pledges received	Gap
2005	\$2.3 billion	\$1.6 billion	\$0.7 billion
2006	\$3.5 billion	\$0.7 billion	\$2.8 billion
2007	\$3.6 billion	\$0.4 billion	\$3.2 billion

Meeting the Needs

While the private sector and foundations should be giving much more to the Global Fund, the reality is that donor countries will need to make up most of the gap.

Donations to the Global Fund are voluntary. In 2005, the Global Fund adopted a mechanism whereby donors can make multi-year pledges to the Global Fund at regularly scheduled replenishment conferences. Three meetings were slated for the 2005 replenishment cycle: 14-16 March in Stockholm; 20-21 June in Rome; and 5-7 September in London.

[‡] The Global Fund conducted a separate and parallel exercise to estimate its resource needs based on the Fund's share of estimated global need for the three diseases. This exercise produced similar results: \$3.6 billion for 2006 and \$4.0 billion for 2007 (excluding operating costs).

Over the years, several formulae have been advanced for calculating what might constitute each country's "fair share" of the Global Fund's resource needs. One such formula was the Equitable Contribution Framework (ECF), a concept first advanced in 2002, and further developed by Aidspan, a small independent NGO whose mission is to monitor and reinforce the effectiveness of the Global Fund.[§] The basis of the ECF is that countries should contribute based on the size of their respective economies.

In May 2005, in preparation for the June 2005 Replenishment Conference, the Global Fund prepared a discussion paper in which it outlined five possible formulae (called "contribution scenarios" in the paper) for fulfilling the \$7.1 billion in resources that the Fund needs for 2006 and 2007.³ One of the scenarios (the Pro-Rata scenario) assumes that each country's share is determined by basing it on its share of the contributions given to the Fund to date. Three of the scenarios are based on each country's share of replenishment mechanisms for other international funds. The fifth scenario (the Adjusted GNI scenario) is based on each country's share of global Gross National Income (GNI) – previously called Gross National Product – adjusted by GNI per capita.^{**} The Adjusted GNI scenario is very similar to the ECF.

Of the five contribution scenarios outlined in the Global Fund discussion paper, the Adjusted GNI scenario is the most promising advocacy tool.

The table on the next page shows the contributions that are required of each country for 2006 and 2007 according to the Adjusted GNI scenario. The table also shows (a) the average annual contributions to date for each country; and (b) the contributions required of each country for 2006 and 2007 according to the Pro-Rata scenario (which is based on contributions to date). (For details of the other three scenarios, please consult the discussion paper: www.aidspan.org/gfo/docs/gfo63.pdf .)

Some donor countries may choose to give according to one or the other of the contribution scenarios shown in the table (or to any of the other scenarios described in the Global Fund paper). Other donor countries may be reluctant to endorse any contribution scenario because they want to be free to make their own decisions. Nevertheless, these scenarios are strong advocacy tools that can be used by NGOs to influence their governments' contributions.

[§] A description of the ECF can be found on the Aidspan website via www.aidspan.org/globalfund/papers.

^{**} If two countries have the same GNI, but one has a much larger population and hence a lower GNI per capita, the country with the smaller population would be expected to contribute more, based on having a greater ability to give.

Table –Two Possible Contribution Scenarios for Meeting the Global Fund’s Resource Needs for 2006 plus 2007 (in \$US millions)⁴

Donors	Average Annual Contribution to date	Total Contributions Required for 2006-2007	
		Pro-Rata Scenario (1)	Adjusted GNI Scenario (2)
Australia	13.8	83	65
Austria	1.1	6	40
Belgium	9.9	60	47
Brazil	0.05	0	9
Canada	33.3	201	129
China	2.0	12	11
Denmark	14.9	90	41
E.C. (3)	150.6	909	909
Finland	0.0	0	26
France	105.8	638	256
Germany	31.8	192	359
Greece	0.0	0	13
India	0.0	0	2
Ireland	11.1	67	20
Italy	115.0	694	183
Japan	82.2	496	1,015
Korea (Rep. of)	0.5	3	47
Kuwait	1.0	6	5
Luxembourg	1.9	11	6
Mexico	0.0	0	27
Netherlands	35.3	213	76
New Zealand	0.7	4	7
Nigeria	9.1	55	0
Norway	17.8	108	58
Portugal	0.5	3	10
Russia	3.3	20	7
Saudi Arabia	2.5	15	13
Singapore	0.2	1	13
South Africa	2.0	12	2
Spain	25.0	151	81
Sweden	27.2	164	51
Switzerland	4.1	25	83
Thailand	1.0	6	2
UK	59.5	359	324
US	360.5	2,176	2,839
Other Countries	1.3	8	14
Sub-Total	1,125.1	6,790	6,790
Priv. Sector (3)	51.4	310	310
TOTAL	1,176.5	7,100	7,100

Notes for the table:

1. In the Pro-Rata scenario, each country's share of the \$7.1 billion required for 2006 plus 2007 is based on its share of the contributions given to the Fund to date.
2. In the Adjusted GNI scenario, each country's share of the \$7.1 billion required for 2006 plus 2007 is based on that country's share of global GNI, adjusted by GNI per capita.
3. For both scenarios, it is assumed that the shares of the European Commission and the Private Sector will be equal to their shares of the contributions to date.

(Some of the countries listed in the table are developing countries. They are included because they have previously given donations to the Global Fund.)

Please see the Appendix for a more detailed table describing these two scenarios.

The Global Fund's needs are sharply increasing. Whichever scenario one chooses, therefore, almost all countries will need to give more in the future than they have given to date.

A comparison of the two scenarios presented in the table shows that some countries would be giving more under the Pro-Rata Scenario than under the Adjusted GNI scenario. The countries that would be giving more under the Pro-Rata scenarios are those that have been very generous to date in terms of their contributions and could be said to have given more than their fair share.

For example, Italy, which has given an average annual contribution to date of \$115 million, which is generous, would be required to give \$694 million under the Pro-Rata scenario for 2006-2007, but only \$183 million under the Adjusted GNI scenario.

On the other hand, Japan, which has so far given an average of \$82.2 million a year, which is less than its fair share, would be required to give far more under the Adjusted GNI scenario (\$1,015 million) for 2006-2007 than under the Pro-Rata scenario (\$496 million).

Advocates and activists can argue that their countries should give the higher of the two numbers in the table – i.e., the Pro-Rata number or the Adjusted GNI number, whichever is higher. Advocates and activists in the countries that are not giving their fair share will have no trouble arguing that their governments need to contribute a far greater share of the Global Fund resources. Advocates and activists in countries that have been generous can argue that their governments need to continue to contribute at the level of their current share (or greater) because there will always be countries that do not contribute their fair share.

Chapter 4 – Advocacy Strategies for NGOs in Developing Countries

Project Implementation

It is critical that projects funded by the Global Fund in developing countries be successful – not only because these projects are important in their own right in terms of the fight against HIV/AIDS (and malaria and tuberculosis), but also because if there are many unsuccessful projects, donors may be reluctant to increase their contributions to the Global Fund.

Strategy No. 1 – Monitor the implementation of Global Fund projects in your country. Here are some steps that you can take:

- ⇒ Study the Data Sheet for your country on the Aidspace website. The one-page Data Sheets show how well each project is doing against its targets. They serve as an early warning system regarding projects that may be in trouble. The Data Sheets are available via www.aidspace.org ; click on “Analysis of Global Fund Grants.”
- ⇒ Maintain good relationships with your Country Coordinating Mechanism (CCM). Some NGOs are represented on the CCM. The CCM may know if there are problems with project implementation.
- ⇒ Maintain good relationships with the Principal Recipient (PR). There may be more than one for each project. The PRs are responsible to the Global Fund for project implementation.

Strategy No. 2 – If there are problems with the implementation of Global Fund projects, apply pressure on the government, the CCM, and other players as appropriate, to correct the problems. This strategy will be more effective if the pressure is well-informed; hence the need to monitor the situation carefully as outlined in Strategy No. 1.

Strategy No. 3 – Assess the effectiveness of your CCM and, if necessary, advocate for improvements in the way it is structured or the way it operates. If the CCM is not operating effectively, this could result in (a) inferior proposals being submitted to the Global Fund; and (b) inadequate monitoring of the implementation of projects approved by the Fund. (See Chapter 6 – Resources for details on “The Aidspace Guide to Building and Running an Effective CCM.”)

Global Fund Resources

While most Global Fund resources come from donor countries, there are nevertheless strategies that advocates and activists in developing countries can adopt to push for increased resources.

Strategy No. 4 – Apply informed pressure on your government to urge donor governments to give more money to the Global Fund. Chapter 3 of this guide contains information that will help inform your advocacy in this area.

Strategy No. 5 – If the opportunity arises, apply pressure directly on donor governments to increase their contributions to the Global Fund. One possibility is to make your views known to the ambassadors of donor countries who are posted to your country. There may be other opportunities.

Strategy No. 6 – Use international fora such as regional and international AIDS conferences to remind donor governments (collectively) of the need to adequately fund the Global Fund.

Chapter 5 – Advocacy Strategies for NGOs in Developed Countries

Advocates and activists in developed countries need to focus on ensuring that their governments are contributing adequately to the Global Fund. See Chapter 3 of this guide for a discussion of funding needs and possible contribution scenarios. Because the Global Fund's needs are growing, almost all donor governments need to give more in the coming years than they have to date. The following strategies assume that contributions must increase in your country.

Strategy No. 1 – Determine what approach you are going to use with your government. It may be based on the Adjusted GNI scenario described in Chapter 3. It may be based on your country's history of giving to the Global Fund. Or it may be based on entirely different factors. Set a goal for how much you want your government to contribute.

Strategy No. 2 – Apply pressure on your government to increase its contributions to the Global Fund. Emphasize that the increased funding should be new money – i.e., it should not be money that is already allocated to HIV/AIDS programs or other development spending.

Strategy No. 3 – Pressure your government to urge other donor governments to increase their contributions to the Global Fund.

Strategy No. 4 – Pressure your government to offer technical assistance to those countries that appear to be having problems keeping their Global Fund-financed projects on schedule (or to facilitate such assistance).

Strategy No. 5 – Apply pressure to the private sector through consortiums, such as the Global Business Coalition and Funders Concerned About AIDS, to increase involvement and contributions from the business community.

Strategy No. 6 – Contact the people who handle the HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria portfolios in major private foundations, and encourage them to support the Fund.

Chapter 6 - Resources

Documents

Aidspan. The Aidspan Guide to Building and Running an Effective CCM. December 2004. Available via www.aidspan.org/guides.

Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Addressing HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis: The Resource Needs of the Global Fund, 2005-2007. Available via www.theglobalfund.org.

Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. The Global Fund Voluntary Replenishment 2005: A Technical Note on Contribution Scenarios. Available via www.theglobalfund.org and at www.aidspan.org/gfo/docs/gfo63.pdf.

Websites

www.aidspan.org

The Aidspan website contains a number of useful resources, including the CCM Guide mentioned above. Particularly relevant to this Advocacy Guide are the one-page Data Sheets on each grant showing how well each project is doing against its targets. The grants are listed by country. The Data Sheets can be accessed via www.aidspan.org/grants.

www.icaso.org

The ICASO website contains documents related to the Global Fund, as well as documents and links on other HIV/AIDS-related issues.

http://unstats.un.org/unsd/mi/mi_goals.asp

The Millennium Indicators Databases, available at this site, provides detailed information on the MDG goals, targets and indicators.

Appendix: Two Possible Contribution Scenarios

The table below provides a detailed depiction of two possible contribution scenarios for meeting the Global Fund's resource needs for 2006 plus 2007.⁵ Some analysis of the information in the table appears on the next page.

Donors	Average Annual Contribution to date		Total Contributions Required for 2006-2007		
	US\$ (in millions)	%	Pro-Rata Scenario (1)	Adjusted GNI Scenario (2)	
			US\$ (in millions)	%	US\$ (in millions)
Australia	13.8	1.2%	83	0.9%	65
Austria	1.1	0.1%	6	0.6%	40
Belgium	9.9	0.8%	60	0.7%	47
Brazil	0.05	0.0%	0	0.1%	9
Canada	33.3	2.8%	201	1.8%	129
China	2.0	0.2%	12	0.1%	11
Denmark	14.9	1.3%	90	0.6%	41
E.C. (3)	150.6	12.8%	909	12.8%	909
Finland	0.0	0.0%	0	0.4%	26
France	105.8	9.0%	638	3.6%	256
Germany	31.8	2.7%	192	5.1%	359
Greece	0.0	0.0%	0	0.2%	13
India	0.0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
Ireland	11.1	0.9%	67	0.3%	20
Italy	115.0	9.8%	694	2.6%	183
Japan	82.2	7.0%	496	14.3%	1,015
Korea (Rep. of)	0.5	0.0%	3	0.7%	47
Kuwait	1.0	0.1%	6	0.1%	5
Luxembourg	1.9	0.2%	11	0.1%	6
Mexico	0.0	0.0%	0	0.4%	27
Netherlands	35.3	3.0%	213	1.1%	76
New Zealand	0.7	0.1%	4	0.1%	7
Nigeria	9.1	0.8%	55	0.0%	0
Norway	17.8	1.5%	108	0.8%	58
Portugal	0.5	0.0%	3	0.1%	10
Russia	3.3	0.3%	20	0.1%	7
Saudi Arabia	2.5	0.2%	15	0.2%	13
Singapore	0.2	0.0%	1	0.2%	13
South Africa	2.0	0.2%	12	0.0%	2
Spain	25.0	2.1%	151	1.1%	81
Sweden	27.2	2.3%	164	0.7%	51
Switzerland	4.1	0.3%	25	1.2%	83
Thailand	1.0	0.1%	6	0.0%	2
UK	59.5	5.1%	359	4.6%	324
US	360.5	30.6%	2,176	40.0%	2,839
Other Countries	1.3	0.1%	8	0.2%	14
Sub-Total	1,125.1	95.6%	6,790	95.6%	6,790
Priv. Sector (3)	51.4	4.4%	310	4.4%	310
TOTAL	1,176.5	100.0%	7,100	100.0%	7,100

Notes for the table:

1. In the Pro-Rata scenario, each country's share of the \$7.1 billion required for 2006 plus 2007 is based on its share of the contributions given to the Fund to date.
2. In the Adjusted GNI scenario, each country's share of the \$7.1 billion required for 2006 plus 2007 is based on that country's share of global GNI, adjusted by GNI per capita.
3. For both scenarios, it is assumed that the shares of the European Commission and the Private Sector will be equal to their shares of the contributions to date.

When analyzing the table, one needs to look at both the dollar amounts and the percentage shares. In terms of actual dollars required for 2006 and 2007, almost all countries will need to give more under the Adjusted GNI scenario than they are currently giving. This argument should be front and centre in any advocacy campaign.

When one looks at the percentage shares, however, it is apparent that the Adjusted GNI scenario has some limitations as an advocacy tool. While the scenario clearly demonstrates that some countries are not pulling their weight, it also shows that certain countries are contributing more than their "fair share."

For example, according to the Adjusted GNI scenario, the United States should be contributing 40.0 percent of Global Fund resources, whereas it currently contributes 30.6 percent. With respect to the \$7.1 billion target for 2006 and 2007, the difference between 30.6 percent and 40.0 percent is \$663 million.

Other countries that are under-contributing (according to the Adjusted GNI scenario) include Japan (should contribute 14.3 percent, currently contributes 7.3 percent), Germany (5.1 percent vs. 2.7 percent), Korea (0.7 percent vs. 0.0 percent) and Switzerland (1.2 percent vs. 0.3 percent). Advocates and activists in these countries will have no trouble arguing that their governments need to contribute a far greater share of the Global Fund resources.

However, Canada, France, Italy, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden are all contributing a greater share of the Global Fund resources now than they would be under the Adjusted GNI scenario. Advocates and activists in those countries will need to take a different tack. They can argue that their governments need to continue to contribute at the level of their current share (or greater) because there will always be countries that do not contribute their fair share.

Because of the fact that Global Fund resource needs are growing, even many of the countries that could be categorized as "over-contributors" in percentage share terms will need to give more in absolute dollar terms if they want to maintain their current contribution share. For example, Norway, which has given an average of \$17.8 million a year to date, will need to give \$58 million for 2006 and 2007 combined. France, which has given an average of \$105.8 million a year, will need to give \$256 million for 2006 and 2007 combined.

The bottom line is that advocates in each country should examine the percentages and actual dollar figures for their country and determine which advocacy strategy will be most effective for them.

Endnotes

¹ Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Resource Needs of the Global Fund 2005-2007. (See Chapter 6 – Resources.)

² Ibid.

³ Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. The Global Fund Voluntary Replenishment 2005: A Technical Note on Contribution Scenarios. (See Chapter 6 – Resources.)

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.