



Independent observer
of the Global Fund

GLOBAL FUND HAS PROVIDED BRIDGE FUNDING OF \$378 MILLION FOR 11 SHORTENED GRANTS

According to the Secretariat, the Global Fund has provided funding in the amount of \$378.2 million for 11 shortened grants from six countries to bridge them through to 31 December 2017. The funding comes from money made available through portfolio optimization.

An HIV grant to Tanzania received the largest award (\$109.1 million). Another HIV grant, this one to Mozambique, received \$77.0 million (see the table for a full list of the funding awards.)

Table: Additional funding awarded to countries that had shortened grants

Country	Component	Grant	Additional funding
Kenya	Malaria	KEN-M-AMREF	\$2,
		KEN-M-TNT	\$12,
Mozambique	HIV	MOZ-H-MOH	\$76,
	Malaria	MOZ-M-MOH	\$43,
		MOZ-M-WV	\$17,
Sudan	Malaria	SDN-M-UNDP	\$31,
Tanzania	HIV	TZA-H-MOF	\$109,
Uganda	HIV	UGA-H-MoFPED	\$36,
	Malaria	UGA-M-MoFPED	\$24,

In addition, the Secretariat said, four countries used savings and efficiencies from within their own grants to bridge activities in their shortened malaria grants until December: DR Congo, Ghana, Nigeria and South Sudan.

Although the Global Fund Board intended that the 2014-2016 allocations would cover implementers through to at least 31 December 2017, it gave the Secretariat the authority to approve grants with earlier end dates. These became known as “shortened grants.” It is believed that the most common reason for countries requesting a shorter grant implementation period is that the shorter period – and a higher rate of spending – was necessary to ensure the provision of essential services at existing levels.

However, having approved the shorter grant implementation periods, the Global Fund decided that it also needed to find the resources to enable these grants to continue functioning until the end of 2017 (given that 1 January 2018 was the earliest date applicants and implementers could expect to access funding from the 2017-2019 allocations).

The funds for portfolio optimization come mainly from savings and efficiencies achieved in the entire Global Fund portfolio of grants. They can also come from additional donations. However, in this particular case, according to the Technical Review Panel (TRP), some of the funding came from reductions in incentive funding awards. On 1 April 2015, we [reported](#) the TRP as saying that its incentive funding recommendations for components submitted in Window 4 were reduced because the Secretariat “saw no other option to cover gaps for countries with shortened grant durations.” The TRP made this statement in an [update](#) on funding requests provided to the Board (see Board Document GF-B33-10).

All of the countries that received awards for shortened grants submitted funding requests for 2017-2019 for the components involved in either Window 1 (20 March 2017) or Window 2 (23 May 2017).

[Read More](#)
