



Independent observer  
of the Global Fund

## GLOBAL FUND PROVIDES RESULTS OF ELIGIBILITY SCREENING FOR TFM PROPOSALS

As it has done for past rounds of funding, the Global Fund Secretariat assessed all proposals submitted under the Transitional Funding Mechanism (TFM) to ensure they met the minimum requirements for coordinating mechanisms and non-CCM proposals. There were 61 proposals from 48 applicants. All 61 proposals were deemed to be eligible; none were screened out.

In contrast to previous screening processes, the Secretariat did not set up a formal Screening Review Panel. The Secretariat said that it decided instead to adopt “a more efficient and streamlined process.” The Secretariat said that the new process was more appropriate given the limited scope of the TFM (i.e. to continue essential services).

The new process involved using the staff of the Grant Management Division to contact CCMs when clarifications were required or remedial action needed to be discussed. The Division has taken on responsibility for liaising with individual CCMs.

A report on the outcomes of the screening was included in an annex to the report on the TFM proposals sent to the Global Fund Board by the Secretariat and the Technical Review Panel (TRP).

The Secretariat said that from now on, the minimum requirements will be monitored on a regular basis and not just at the time of applying for new funding.

The six minimum requirements are as follows:

1. Proposal development. There was an open, transparent and documented process to solicit and

- review proposal submissions.
2. PR nomination. There was a transparent and documented process to nominate the principal recipients (PRs).
3. Oversight. The CCM has implemented an oversight plan for all financing approved by the Global Fund.
4. Membership (I). There is evidence of the membership of people living with HIV and of people affected by TB or malaria.
5. Membership (II): There was a transparent and documented process to demonstrate that CCM members representing non-government constituencies were selected by their own constituencies.
6. COI. A policy to manage conflict of interest that applies to all CCM members was developed, published and applied.

Of the 48 applicants, 45 were CCMs or regional coordinating mechanisms (RCMs). (The other three applicants were Non-CCMs.) In the initial screening performed by the Secretariat, 27 of these 45 applicants (including all RCMs) were found to be fully compliant. The other 18 were rated as “indeterminate compliant (IC),” meaning that there were some concerns about whether they met one or more of the requirements. Of the 18 deemed IC, 10 were considered IC for just one requirement; seven for two requirements; and one for four requirements. All of the CCMs initially deemed IC were ultimately screened in. (As explained above, the Secretariat adopted a less rigorous process for the TFM compared to previous rounds of funding.)

The first two minimum requirements – proposal development and PR nomination – are applicable only at the time of submission of new funding applications. Three CCMs – Guatemala, Yemen and Suriname – were assessed as IC with respect to both requirements. Another eight CCMs – Afghanistan, Djibouti, Jamaica, Malawi, Tanzania, Burundi, Egypt and Viet Nam – were deemed to be IC for the PR nomination requirement.

Regional Teams in the Grant Management Division contacted the CCMs assessed as IC and discussed with them how to ensure that they comply with the requirements when submitting proposals in future.

For example, the Secretariat found the Egyptian CCM non-compliant with the PR nomination requirement because the CCM nominated the Ministry of Health and Populations as PR but did not provide evidence that the ministry’s staff had recused themselves from the discussion at the CCM. The Regional Team reiterated the importance of following the CCM’s COI policy when nominating a PR.

Another example: The Secretariat found Yemen IC with the proposal development requirement because there was discontent expressed by a number of CCM members about the limited time provided to review the proposals and “the recurring lack of CCM engagement over the years.” After discussions with the Regional Team, the CCM set up a task force to address the issues. The Secretariat said that it will monitor the situation.

Requirements 3–6 concern the structure and operations of the CCM. Eight CCMs – Botswana, Nicaragua, South Sudan, Bhutan, Burundi, Central African Republic, Egypt and Suriname – were assessed as IC for Requirement 3 (oversight). Three CCMs – Azerbaijan, Romania and Suriname – were deemed IC for Requirements 4 and 5 (membership). Three CCMs – Bhutan, Central African Republic and Viet Nam – were judged IC for Requirement 6 (COI).

For CCMs assessed as IC with one or more of these requirements, the Regional Teams and the CCMs have agreed on remedial actions.

For example: The Secretariat found South Sudan IC for the oversight requirement because the current oversight plan does not cover the entire TFM period, and the CCM’s oversight committee does not include

non-CCM members. Following discussions with the Regional Team, the CCM decided to request technical assistance to help the CCM improve its oversight, including revising the oversight plan. The Secretariat said that it will monitor the situation.

Another example: The Secretariat found Bhutan IC for the COI requirement because the CCM's COI policy covered only the Chair and Vice-Chair. Following discussions with the Regional Team, the CCM committed to reviewing all CCM requirements during an upcoming visit from Regional Team members.

The CCM that was assessed as IC for four requirements was Suriname. It was found to be IC for the requirements related to proposal development, PR nomination, oversight and membership (Requirement 5). For example, the Secretariat said that no information was provided on the sectors and roles of the members of the CCM's Oversight Committee. Following discussions with the Regional Team, the CCM has submitted a "basic" oversight plan (and governance manual).

All three Non-CCM applicants were deemed to have met the requirements for this category.

Editor's Note: In addition to the eligibility screening conducted by the Global Fund Secretariat, the Technical Review Panel (TRP) assessed whether proposals were compliant with the Global Fund's requirements concerning focus of proposal and counterpart financing. Details of this assessment can be found in the report on the TFM proposals sent to the Global Fund Board by the Secretariat and the TRP. (See also GFO article in this issue on lessons learned.)

The report of the Secretariat and the TRP on the TFM proposals is available on the Global Fund website at [www.theglobalfund.org/en/trp/reports](http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/trp/reports).

[Read More](#)

---