



Independent observer
of the Global Fund

THE MAJOR STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS TO THE FUND

Chapter 3 of “The Aidspan Guide to Round 5 Applications to the Global Fund” discusses the strengths and weaknesses of applications submitted in Rounds 3 and 4. The list provided is based on an extensive analysis by Aidspan of comments made on those applications by the TRP.

The main strengths that the TRP has mentioned are as follows:

1. The proposal was clear and well-documented; the strategy was sound.
2. There was good involvement of partners (including NGOs and other sectors) in the implementation plan.
3. There was a strong political commitment to implement the project.
4. The project targeted high-risk groups and vulnerable populations.
5. The proposal demonstrated complementarity – i.e., it built on existing activities.
6. The proposal demonstrated sustainability – i.e., national budgets were identified to help sustain the activities once Global Fund support terminated.
7. The goals, objectives, activities, outcomes, and budgets were well aligned.
8. The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan was solid.
9. The budget was well detailed.
10. There was good collaboration among programs addressing the three diseases.
11. The project was realistic and achievable.
12. The proposal contained a good situational analysis.
13. The proposal reflected comments made by the TRP during earlier rounds of funding.
14. The proposal built on the national strategic plan or other existing programs.
15. The CCM was strong and had wide sectoral representation.

16. The proposal demonstrated good co-funding.
17. The Principal Recipient(PR) is a strong organization, with experience managing similar programs.
18. The proposal contained innovative strategies, some of which could lead to best practices.
19. The proposal built on lessons learned and best practices.
20. The proposal built on earlier projects financed by the Global Fund.

The main weaknesses that the TRP has mentioned are as follows:

1. The workplan was inadequate. There was insufficient, unclear or questionable information on one or more of the following: the rationale, the strategic approach, the objectives, the activities and the expected outcomes.
2. The budget information was inaccurate, questionable and/or not sufficiently detailed.
3. The various sections of the proposal were not well aligned.
4. The M&E plan was either missing or inadequate.
5. The budget (and therefore the project) was imbalanced; too much or too little was allocated to one or more sectors or activities.
6. The treatment, care and support component of the proposal was missing or inadequate.
7. In HIV/AIDS and TB proposals, there were either no joint activities or insufficient joint activities involving both diseases.
8. The project was too ambitious; some or all of the goals and objectives were not realistic.
9. The use of partners (including NGOs and other sectors) in the implementation of the project was inadequate or unclear.
10. The impact and/or outcome indicators were inappropriate or poorly defined.
11. The project did not focus sufficiently on vulnerable groups.
12. The proposal did not demonstrate complementarity or additionality; it was not clear how the project related or added to existing programs.
13. The proposal did not contain a good situational analysis and/or provide adequate baseline information.
14. The plan for procurement and supply chain management was inadequate.
15. The CCM was not sufficiently representative.
16. There were problems concerning the PR.

“The Aidspan Guide to Round 5 Applications to the Global Fund” discusses all of these in detail, and provides links to proposals and TRP comments that provide illustrations of the strengths.

[Read More](#)
