



Independent observer
of the Global Fund

Consolidated Proposals, Single-Stream-of-Funding Agreements and Grant Consolidation

Editor's Note: This is a condensed version of a section in Volume 1 of the "The Aidspan Guide to Round 11 Applications to the Global Fund."

Editor's Note: This is a condensed version of a section in Volume 1 of the "The Aidspan Guide to Round 11 Applications to the Global Fund."

The Global Fund's new grant architecture is designed to streamline and improve both the applications process and programme implementation. One of the ways it does so is by consolidating programmes and grants so that there is only one agreement per principal recipient (PR) per disease or health systems strengthening (HSS) programme.

The concept is easy enough to grasp, but how it is implemented can be fairly complicated. In this article, we describe the relationship between consolidated proposals, single-stream-of-funding (SSF) agreements and grant consolidation.

Grant consolidation involves merging two or more existing grants for the same PR and disease into one. Anytime two or more existing grants have been consolidated into one, an SSF agreement is signed with the PR. SSF agreements are very similar to the grant agreements that have been used up to now. The most significant differences are (a) the provisions for periodic reviews (replacing Phase 2 reviews); and (b) the fact that the SSF grant agreements will be revised after each periodic review and whenever additional funding for the PR is approved in a future round. Under the new grant architecture, the periodic reviews will be carried out at the same time for all SSF agreements for a given disease/HSS programme, regardless of how many different PRs are involved.

A consolidated proposal describes the entire disease programme for which the applicant is seeking funding. Round 11 consolidated proposals will include information (e.g., objectives, service delivery areas, activities, targets and costs) for both (a) new initiatives for which funding is being sought, and (b) all existing grants for the same disease (except for grants that are scheduled to end before the proposed start date of the new initiatives). All agreements signed as a result of Round 11 proposals will be SSF agreements.

How will this work in practice? In the following examples, we use a fictitious country (Ruritania). Also, whenever we refer to an existing grant, we assume that the grant will not end before the proposed start date of the new initiatives in the Round 11 proposal.

First example: Ruritania has an existing TB grant being managed by PR A. Ruritania submits a consolidated TB proposal in Round 11 and nominates PR A to manage the new initiatives in the proposal. The Round 11 proposal is approved.

The Global Fund Secretariat will sign an SSF agreement with PR A. The agreement will cover both the activities that were retained from the existing TB grant and the new initiatives in the Round 11 proposal. The “old” grant agreement with PR A will be terminated. This is not called “grant consolidation” because there is no separate process to merge the two grants. The “consolidation” is done via the consolidated proposal: The objectives, SDAs, activities, indicators and budgets for the existing activities and the new initiatives will have all been brought together into one unified framework in the consolidated proposal.

Second example: Ruritania has two TB grants, one being managed by PR B, the other by PR C. Ruritania submits a consolidated TB proposal in Round 11 and nominates PR B to manage the new activities in the proposal. The Round 11 proposal is approved.

In the second example, an SSF agreement will be signed with PR B, covering both the activities that were retained from the existing TB grant with PR B and the new initiatives in the Round 11 proposal. As with the first example, this is not referred to as “grant consolidation.” In addition, an SSF agreement will be signed with PR C, even though the existing grant being managed by PR C is not involved in any “consolidation.” It is necessary to sign an SSF agreement with PR C to ensure that PR C is on the same implementation and periodic review schedule as PR B.

Third example: Ruritania has two TB grants, both being managed by PR D. Ruritania submits a consolidated TB proposal in Round 11 and nominates PR E to manage the new activities in the proposal. The Round 11 proposal is approved.

In the third example, an SSF agreement will be signed with PR E, covering the new initiatives in the Round 11 proposal. In addition, an SSF agreement will be signed with PR D, covering all of the activities that are being retained from the two existing grants being managed by PR D. The “old” grant agreements with PR D will be terminated. PR D does not need to go through a formal grant consolidation process because all of the information needed to produce an SSF agreement will be in the Round 11 consolidated

proposal.

Fourth Example: Ruritania has two TB grants, both being managed by PR F. Ruritania submits a consolidated TB proposal in Round 11 and nominates PR F to manage the new activities in the proposal. The Round 11 proposal is not approved.

In the fourth example, because the Round 11 consolidated proposal was not approved, Ruritania will not be required to consolidate the two existing grants being managed by PR F. (Ruritania may choose to consolidate the two existing grants, but it is not a requirement. If Ruritania does choose to consolidate the two existing grants, an SSF agreement will be signed with PR F.)

Fifth Example: The Global Fund already has an SSF agreement with Ruritania's PR G covering TB. Ruritania submits a consolidated TB proposal in Round 11 and nominates PR G to manage the new activities in the proposal. The Round 11 proposal is approved.

In the fifth example, the SSF agreement with PR G will be amended to add the new initiatives in the Round 11 proposal (and, if applicable, to make any changes to the initiatives from the existing SSF agreement).

Note: These examples cover some of the more common situations that will arise, but not every possible situation. Potential applicants should contact the Global Fund Secretariat if they are unsure about how their own situation will be handled.

"Getting a Head Start," Volume 1 of the "The Aidspan Guide to Round 11 Applications to the Global Fund," is available on the Aidspan website [here](#). The Global Fund has issued an information note on consolidated proposals, available [here](#).

=====

Erratum

There were two errors in our article on "[Grant Consolidation and Round 11](#)" in GFO 145.

(1) The article provides several examples of hypothetical situations where grants would be consolidated as part of the Round 11 proposal process. As explained above, technically speaking these are not referred to as "grant consolidations" because there is no separate process to consolidate the grants.

(2) The article provided the following example:

Fourth example: Ruritania has two TB grants, both being managed by PR A. Ruritania submits a consolidated TB proposal in Round 11 and nominates PR B to manage the new activities in the proposal.

and said that, in this example, "A new SSF grant agreement would be signed with PR B, and the existing grant agreements with PR A would continue unchanged." The last part is not correct. An SSF agreement would also be signed with PR A covering all of the activities being retained from the two grants PR A is managing. (See the third example in the article above, which is identical to this example.)

=====

The Global Fund's new grant architecture is designed to streamline and improve both the applications process and programme implementation. One of the ways it does so is by consolidating programmes and grants so that there is only one agreement per principal recipient (PR) per disease or health systems

strengthening (HSS) programme.

The concept is easy enough to grasp, but how it is implemented can be fairly complicated. In this article, we describe the relationship between consolidated proposals, single-stream-of-funding (SSF) agreements and grant consolidation.

Grant consolidation involves merging two or more existing grants for the same PR and disease into one. Anytime two or more existing grants have been consolidated into one, an SSF agreement is signed with the PR. SSF agreements are very similar to the grant agreements that have been used up to now. The most significant differences are (a) the provisions for periodic reviews (replacing Phase 2 reviews); and (b) the fact that the SSF grant agreements will be revised after each periodic review and whenever additional funding for the PR is approved in a future round. Under the new grant architecture, the periodic reviews will be carried out at the same time for all SSF agreements for a given disease/HSS programme, regardless of how many different PRs are involved.

A consolidated proposal describes the entire disease programme for which the applicant is seeking funding. Round 11 consolidated proposals will include information (e.g., objectives, service delivery areas, activities, targets and costs) for both (a) new initiatives for which funding is being sought, and (b) all existing grants for the same disease (except for grants that are scheduled to end before the proposed start date of the new initiatives). All agreements signed as a result of Round 11 proposals will be SSF agreements.

How will this work in practice? In the following examples, we use a fictitious country (Ruritania). Also, whenever we refer to an existing grant, we assume that the grant will not end before the proposed start date of the new initiatives in the Round 11 proposal.

First example: Ruritania has an existing TB grant being managed by PR A. Ruritania submits a consolidated TB proposal in Round 11 and nominates PR A to manage the new initiatives in the proposal. The Round 11 proposal is approved.

The Global Fund Secretariat will sign an SSF agreement with PR A. The agreement will cover both the activities that were retained from the existing TB grant and the new initiatives in the Round 11 proposal. The “old” grant agreement with PR A will be terminated. This is not called “grant consolidation” because there is no separate process to merge the two grants. The “consolidation” is done via the consolidated proposal: The objectives, SDAs, activities, indicators and budgets for the existing activities and the new initiatives will have all been brought together into one unified framework in the consolidated proposal.

Second example: Ruritania has two TB grants, one being managed by PR B, the other by PR C. Ruritania submits a consolidated TB proposal in Round 11 and nominates PR B to manage the new activities in the proposal. The Round 11 proposal is approved.

In the second example, an SSF agreement will be signed with PR B, covering both the activities that were retained from the existing TB grant with PR B and the new initiatives in the Round 11 proposal. As with the first example, this is not referred to as “grant consolidation.” In addition, an SSF agreement will be signed with PR C, even though the existing grant being managed by PR C is not involved in any “consolidation.” It is necessary to sign an SSF agreement with PR C to ensure that PR C is on the same implementation and periodic review schedule as PR B.

Third example: Ruritania has two TB grants, both being managed by PR D. Ruritania submits a consolidated TB proposal in Round 11 and nominates PR E to manage the new activities in the proposal. The Round 11 proposal is approved.

In the third example, an SSF agreement will be signed with PR E, covering the new initiatives in the

Round 11 proposal. In addition, an SSF agreement will be signed with PR D, covering all of the activities that are being retained from the two existing grants being managed by PR D. The “old” grant agreements with PR D will be terminated. PR D does not need to go through a formal grant consolidation process because all of the information needed to produce an SSF agreement will be in the Round 11 consolidated proposal.

Fourth Example: Ruritania has two TB grants, both being managed by PR F. Ruritania submits a consolidated TB proposal in Round 11 and nominates PR F to manage the new activities in the proposal. The Round 11 proposal is not approved.

In the fourth example, because the Round 11 consolidated proposal was not approved, Ruritania will not be required to consolidate the two existing grants being managed by PR F. (Ruritania may choose to consolidate the two existing grants, but it is not a requirement. If Ruritania does choose to consolidate the two existing grants, an SSF agreement will be signed with PR F.)

Fifth Example: The Global Fund already has an SSF agreement with Ruritania’s PR G covering TB. Ruritania submits a consolidated TB proposal in Round 11 and nominates PR G to manage the new activities in the proposal. The Round 11 proposal is approved.

In the fifth example, the SSF agreement with PR G will be amended to add the new initiatives in the Round 11 proposal (and, if applicable, to make any changes to the initiatives from the existing SSF agreement).

Note: These examples cover some of the more common situations that will arise, but not every possible situation. Potential applicants should contact the Global Fund Secretariat if they are unsure about how their own situation will be handled.

“Getting a Head Start,” Volume 1 of the “The Aidspan Guide to Round 11 Applications to the Global Fund,” is available on the Aidspan website [here](#). The Global Fund has issued an information note on consolidated proposals, available [here](#).

=====

Erratum

There were two errors in our article on “[Grant Consolidation and Round 11](#)” in GFO 145.

(1) The article provides several examples of hypothetical situations where grants would be consolidated as part of the Round 11 proposal process. As explained above, technically speaking these are not referred to as “grant consolidations” because there is no separate process to consolidate the grants.

(2) The article provided the following example:

Fourth example: Ruritania has two TB grants, both being managed by PR A. Ruritania submits a consolidated TB proposal in Round 11 and nominates PR B to manage the new activities in the proposal.

and said that, in this example, “A new SSF grant agreement would be signed with PR B, and the existing grant agreements with PR A would continue unchanged.” The last part is not correct. An SSF agreement would also be signed with PR A covering all of the activities being retained from the two grants PR A is managing. (See the third example in the article above, which is identical to this example.)

=====

[Read More](#)
