



Independent observer
of the Global Fund

GLOBAL FUND BOARD APPROVES WAVE 4 RCC PROPOSALS

In October 2008, the Global Fund Board approved five proposals in Wave 4 of the Rolling Continuation Channel (RCC) funding channel, representing costs of up to \$229 million over three years. Of the five proposals, two were for HIV, two for TB and one for malaria.

The RCC is a separate channel of funding set up to allow applicants with strongly performing grants to apply for continuing funding for up to an additional six years beyond the original five-year grant term. Selection for RCC funding is a two-stage process. First, the expiring grant has to have performed well enough for the Global Fund Secretariat to issue an invitation to apply for RCC funding. Only about one-third of grants pass that test. Second, the TRP, backed by the Board, then has to approve the RCC application; only about half of the applications pass that test. Aidspan reported on the results of the first three waves of RCC funding in GFO Issue #93, available at www.aidspan.org.gfo.

In Wave 4, the TRP reviewed ten proposals, and recommended five for approval – about the same success rate as in the three previous waves. Two of the ten proposals were re-submissions of unsuccessful proposals from Wave 2; both were approved. This means that only three of the eight new proposals were approved. All 10 applications were from CCMs.

All five proposals that were not recommended for funding were rated Category 3A by the TRP, meaning that applicants are strongly encouraged to re-submit these proposals in a future wave of funding.

Table 1 summarises the results for the first four waves of funding. Table 2 provides the results for Wave 4, by country.

Table 1: RCC applications and results – Waves 1-4

Wave	Number of expiring grants eligible for consideration	Of which: Number and % invited to apply	Of which: Number of proposals submitted	Board decision date	Number of proposals approved		Total budget, Years 1-3	Total budget, Year 4
1	51	11 (22%)	10	Nov 2007	5:	(1 HIV, 3 malaria, 1 TB)	\$130 m.	\$2,400 m.
2	31	11 (36%)	10 ¹	Apr 2008	6:	(3 HIV, 2 malaria, 1 TB)	\$365 m.	\$7,200 m.
3	18	8 (45%)	7+5 ²	July 2008	3+5 ³ :	(4 HIV, 3 malaria, 1 TB)	\$513 m.	\$1,000 m.
4	22	8 (36%)	8+2 ⁴	October 2008	3+2 ⁵ :	(2 HIV, 2 TB, 1 malaria)	\$229 m.	\$500 m.
Total	122	38 (31%)	42		24:	(10 HIV, 9 malaria, 5 TB)	\$1,237 m.	\$2,400 m.

1 This represents nine countries; one applicant submitted a proposal containing two disease elements (which counts as two proposals in the table).

2 There were seven new applications in Wave 3 plus five re-submissions from Wave 1.

3 Three of the new applications and all five of the Wave 1 re-submissions.

4 There were eight new applications in Wave 4 and two re-submissions from Wave 2. The 10 applications represent eight countries: two applicants submitted proposals containing two disease elements (each of which counts as two proposals in the table).

5 Three of the new applications and both of the Wave 2 re-submissions.

Table 2: Wave 4 RCC results by country

Country	Board Decision	Component	Upper ceiling budget, Years 1-3	Upper ceiling budget, Years 1-6
Bangladesh	Not approved: Cat. 3A	HIV	\$36,113,648	\$80,817,375
Dominican Republic	Approved: Cat. 2	HIV	\$45,770,388	\$98,516,291
El Salvador *	Approved: Cat. 2	HIV	\$14,398,031	\$24,678,979

Georgia	Not approved: Cat. 3A	HIV	\$27,159,032	\$56,523,034
Ghana *	Approved: Cat. 2	Malaria	\$89,764,243	\$175,398,885
India	Not approved: Cat. 3A	HIV	\$165,823,154	\$372,514,776
India	Approved: Cat. 2	TB	\$72,095,018	\$199,447,156
Nepal	Not approved: Cat. 3A	Malaria	\$15,648,247	\$30,955,602
Nicaragua	Not approved: Cat. 3A	Malaria	\$5,030,259	\$7,723,758
Nicaragua	Approved: Cat. 2	TB	\$7,165,903	\$11,351,150

* Not approved in Wave 2, but approved upon re-submission in Wave 4.

In its report to the Board on Wave 4 – entitled “Report of the Technical Review Panel and the Secretariat on Funding Recommendations for Wave 4 Rolling Continuation Channel Proposals,” available at www.theglobalfund.org/en/trp/reports – the TRP reiterated many of the concerns that it has raised during previous waves. These include:

- that the RCC has not proven to be an effective funding channel;
- that many applicants fail to make linkages or adjustments to earlier interventions based on the latest epidemiological data; and
- that many applicants do not describe how their proposed activities complement activities already underway.

The TRP also commented on some issues specific to Wave 4. The TRP noted that the proposal form for Wave 4 was revised so that it was consistent with the form used in Round 8 of the rounds-based funding channel. Therefore, the form reflected the Global Fund’s new strategic focus on health systems strengthening (HSS), community systems strengthening (CSS), dual-track financing (DTF) and promoting more gender-sensitive responses.

The TRP said that:

- none of the eight new RCC Wave 4 proposals submitted requests for cross-cutting HSS funding;
- few proposals included efforts to strengthen the capacity of community-based organisations; and
- more often than not, proposals did not present strong gender-focused responses.

The TRP did not comment on the extent to which the Wave 4 proposals adopted dual-track financing.

[Read More](#)
