



Independent observer
of the Global Fund

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF WAVE 5 RCC PROPOSALS

In its report to the Global Fund Board on the results of Wave 5 of the Rolling Continuation Channel (RCC) (see previous article), the TRP identified the key strengths and weakness of the proposals submitted.

The key strengths identified by the TRP were as follows:

- The proposed interventions clearly build on the achievements of the expiring grant and demonstrate additionality and complementarity to existing Global Fund and other funding.
- There is a clear focus on vulnerable or most-at-risk populations.
- The proposed interventions fit within the country's overall health policy and development framework, and are consistent with international guidelines and best practice.
- The proposed activities are developed from a sound assessment of country-specific and epidemiological context.
- The proposals contain performance frameworks representing robust plans for monitoring and evaluation of activity outputs, outcome and impact of interventions.
- There is an appropriate level of detail in the financial gap analysis and needs assessment.
- The budget request includes clear unit costs and assumptions.
- The development of the proposal is based on a broad participation of stakeholders.
- The proposed PR has a proven track record for implementation.
- There is demonstrated commitment from the national government, not only financially, but in terms of forward-looking strategic plans.

The key weaknesses identified by the TRP were as follows:

- The proposal objectives lack adequate level of detail, such as information on responsibilities for implementing the pertinent activities under them.

- There is a lack of detail regarding the synergies among the proposed activities and those currently supported by the Global Fund, the national government, or other donor resources.
- The coordination of proposed TB/HIV activities is left undefined or not included.
- There are inconsistencies among different budget tables within the proposal, as well as large budget items that are insufficiently justified.
- There are unclear expenses, such as overhead, management fees, planning and administration.
- There are weak definitions of the relationships and coordination efforts among PRs, SRs and other implementing bodies.
- There is inappropriate or inadequate disaggregation of key targets and performance indicators.

[Read More](#)
