



Independent observer
of the Global Fund

How will grants work after Round 11?

How do you fit a five-year proposal into a three-year implementation period?

By the time proposals for Round 11 are approved, the Global Fund will be well on its way to implementing the new grant architecture. The word “grant” may still be around (as in “new grant architecture”), but what we now know as a “grant” will be called a “single stream of funding,” or maybe even “SSF” for short. And what we used to call a “grant agreement” will be called a “single-stream-of-funding agreement,” or maybe “SSF agreement” for short.

All proposals submitted for Round 11 have to be consolidated proposals. For all of the proposals approved in Round 11, single-stream-of-funding agreements will be signed with principal recipients (PRs). In most cases, a single-stream-of-funding agreement will cover not only new initiatives included in the proposal, but also all of the PR’s active “grants” for that disease (except perhaps for a grant that is about to expire). So, once the Round 11 single-stream-of-funding agreements have all been sig

How do you fit a five-year proposal into a three-year implementation period?

By the time proposals for Round 11 are approved, the Global Fund will be well on its way to implementing the new grant architecture. The word “grant” may still be around (as in “new grant architecture”), but what we now know as a “grant” will be called a “single stream of funding,” or maybe even “SSF” for short. And what we used to call a “grant agreement” will be called a “single-stream-of-funding agreement,” or maybe “SSF agreement” for short.

All proposals submitted for Round 11 have to be consolidated proposals. For all of the proposals approved in Round 11, single-stream-of-funding agreements will be signed with principal recipients (PRs). In most cases, a single-stream-of-funding agreement will cover not only new initiatives included in the

proposal, but also all of the PR's active "grants" for that disease (except perhaps for a grant that is about to expire). So, once the Round 11 single-stream-of-funding agreements have all been signed, there won't be all that many "old" grants around with more than a few months left to run. By the time the Round 12 single-stream-of-funding agreements have all been signed, the old grant agreements will be an endangered species.

Under the new grant architecture:

- the single streams of funding may last indefinitely, providing new funds are approved periodically for that PR;
- implementation periods for each disease/HSS programme will last up to three years; and a periodic review will be conducted at the end of each implementation period;
- the periodic reviews will be conducted at the same time for all PRs implementing programmes for the disease or HSS programme in question;
- each applicant will submit a "request for additional financial commitment" (this used to be called "request for continued funding") for the next implementation period about nine months prior to the end of the current implementation period;
- the Global Fund Board will decide whether to approve the request for additional financial commitment (and for what amount) about six months prior to the end of the current implementation period; and
- if the Board approves continued funding, an amendment to the single-stream-of-funding agreement will be negotiated and signed.

(For the balance of this article, we are assuming that the reference above to "up to three years" means, in fact, three years.)

The implementation periods remain fixed at three years, regardless of when new funds are approved for that PR. Let's take the example of an HIV single-stream-of-funding agreement signed in December 2012 with PR A from Ruritania, a fictitious country, as a result of a Round 11 proposal having been approved. Let's assume that this is the first HIV programme being managed by PR A. The implementation schedule for this agreement could look something like what is shown in the table below.

Table: Possible Implementation Schedule for a New Single Stream of Funding

Month Number	Actual Date	Event
Month 0	Dec. 2012	Agreement signed
Month 1	Jan. 2013	Start of first implementation period
Month 20	Aug. 2014	New funds added; agreement amended
Month 27	Mar. 2015	Applicant submits request for additional financial commitment for next implementation period; periodic review conducted
Month 30	Jun. 2015	Board approves request for additional financial commitment
By month 36	Dec. 2015	Agreement amended
Month 37	Jan. 2016	Start of second implementation period
Month 63	Mar. 2018	Applicant submits request for additional financial commitment for next implementation period; periodic review conducted
Month 66	Jun. 2018	Board approves request for additional financial commitment
By month 72	Dec. 2018	Agreement amended
Month 73	Jan. 2019	Start of third implementation period
etc.		
etc.		

Note: Because the agreement described in the above table was newly signed (in December 2012), the first periodic review will cover a period of only two years (Jan. 2013 to December 2014); each subsequent

periodic review will cover a period of three years.

The table depicts the first six years (plus one month) of a new single-stream-of-funding agreement. It shows (in bold italics and also in red, unless you are looking at a black and white printout) an infusion of new money in Month 20. Let's assume that the new funds were added to PR A's stream of funding as a result of the Ruritania CCM having submitted a new five-year proposal and the Board having approved it. Since PR A's first implementation period was scheduled to end at Month 36, the Board initially formally approved funding for only the first 17 months of the proposal (corresponding to Months 20 through 36 of the implementation schedule). The next portion of funding from the new proposal would be formally approved (or not) when the CCM submitted its request for additional financial commitment for the second implementation period (in Month 27).

Note that at Month 20, when the first portion of funding from the new proposal was added, the single-stream-of-funding agreement was amended. The agreement is amended at each periodic review and each time new funding is added.

Thus, there is no correlation between the period covered by a proposal (up to five years) and the implementation period for a stream of funding (three years). The implementation periods remain fixed; and new money is added to the stream of funding whenever a new proposal is approved by the Global Fund.

This concept may take a little getting used to for people familiar with the old system – where a proposal covered a five-year period; funding was formally approved for the first two years; a request for funding was submitted and a Phase 2 review conducted; and funding was then formally approved for the remaining three years (or a portion thereof).

ned, there won't be all that many "old" grants around with more than a few months left to run. By the time the Round 12 single-stream-of-funding agreements have all been signed, the old grant agreements will be an endangered species.

Under the new grant architecture:

- the single streams of funding may last indefinitely, providing new funds are approved periodically for that PR;
- implementation periods for each disease/HSS programme will last up to three years; and a periodic review will be conducted at the end of each implementation period;
- the periodic reviews will be conducted at the same time for all PRs implementing programmes for the disease or HSS programme in question;
- each applicant will submit a "request for additional financial commitment" (this used to be called "request for continued funding") for the next implementation period about nine months prior to the end of the current implementation period;
- the Global Fund Board will decide whether to approve the request for additional financial commitment (and for what amount) about six months prior to the end of the current implementation period; and
- if the Board approves continued funding, an amendment to the single-stream-of-funding agreement will be negotiated and signed.

(For the balance of this article, we are assuming that the reference above to "up to three years" means, in fact, three years.)

The implementation periods remain fixed at three years, regardless of when new funds are approved for that PR. Let's take the example of an HIV single-stream-of-funding agreement signed in December 2012 with PR A from Ruritania, a fictitious country, as a result of a Round 11 proposal having been approved.

Let's assume that this is the first HIV programme being managed by PR A. The implementation schedule for this agreement could look something like what is shown in the table below.

How do you fit a five-year proposal into a three-year implementation period?

By the time proposals for Round 11 are approved, the Global Fund will be well on its way to implementing the new grant architecture. The word "grant" may still be around (as in "new grant architecture"), but what we now know as a "grant" will be called a "single stream of funding," or maybe even "SSF" for short. And what we used to call a "grant agreement" will be called a "single-stream-of-funding agreement," or maybe "SSF agreement" for short.

All proposals submitted for Round 11 have to be consolidated proposals. For all of the proposals approved in Round 11, single-stream-of-funding agreements will be signed with principal recipients (PRs). In most cases, a single-stream-of-funding agreement will cover not only new initiatives included in the proposal, but also all of the PR's active "grants" for that disease (except perhaps for a grant that is about to expire). So, once the Round 11 single-stream-of-funding agreements have all been signed, there won't be all that many "old" grants around with more than a few months left to run. By the time the Round 12 single-stream-of-funding agreements have all been signed, the old grant agreements will be an endangered species.

Under the new grant architecture:

- the single streams of funding may last indefinitely, providing new funds are approved periodically for that PR;
- implementation periods for each disease/HSS programme will last up to three years; and a periodic review will be conducted at the end of each implementation period;
- the periodic reviews will be conducted at the same time for all PRs implementing programmes for the disease or HSS programme in question;
- each applicant will submit a "request for additional financial commitment" (this used to be called "request for continued funding") for the next implementation period about nine months prior to the end of the current implementation period;
- the Global Fund Board will decide whether to approve the request for additional financial commitment (and for what amount) about six months prior to the end of the current implementation period; and
- if the Board approves continued funding, an amendment to the single-stream-of-funding agreement will be negotiated and signed.

(For the balance of this article, we are assuming that the reference above to "up to three years" means, in fact, three years.)

The implementation periods remain fixed at three years, regardless of when new funds are approved for that PR. Let's take the example of an HIV single-stream-of-funding agreement signed in December 2012 with PR A from Ruritania, a fictitious country, as a result of a Round 11 proposal having been approved. Let's assume that this is the first HIV programme being managed by PR A. The implementation schedule for this agreement could look something like what is shown in the table below.

Table: Possible Implementation Schedule for a New Single Stream of Funding

Month Number	Actual Date	Event
Month 0	Dec. 2012	Agreement signed
Month 1	Jan. 2013	Start of first implementation period
Month 20	Aug. 2014	New funds added; agreement amended

Month 27	Mar. 2015	Applicant submits request for additional financial commitment for next implementation period; periodic review conducted
Month 30	Jun. 2015	Board approves request for additional financial commitment
By month 36	Dec. 2015	Agreement amended
Month 37	Jan. 2016	Start of second implementation period
Month 63	Mar. 2018	Applicant submits request for additional financial commitment for next implementation period; periodic review conducted
Month 66	Jun. 2018	Board approves request for additional financial commitment
By month 72	Dec. 2018	Agreement amended
Month 73	Jan. 2019	Start of third implementation period
etc.		
etc.		

Note: Because the agreement described in the above table was newly signed (in December 2012), the first periodic review will cover a period of only two years (Jan. 2013 to December 2014); each subsequent periodic review will cover a period of three years.

The table depicts the first six years (plus one month) of a new single-stream-of-funding agreement. It shows (in bold italics and also in red, unless you are looking at a black and white printout) an infusion of new money in Month 20. Let's assume that the new funds were added to PR A's stream of funding as a result of the Ruritania CCM having submitted a new five-year proposal and the Board having approved it. Since PR A's first implementation period was scheduled to end at Month 36, the Board initially formally approved funding for only the first 17 months of the proposal (corresponding to Months 20 through 36 of the implementation schedule). The next portion of funding from the new proposal would be formally approved (or not) when the CCM submitted its request for additional financial commitment for the second implementation period (in Month 27).

Note that at Month 20, when the first portion of funding from the new proposal was added, the single-stream-of-funding agreement was amended. The agreement is amended at each periodic review and each time new funding is added.

Thus, there is no correlation between the period covered by a proposal (up to five years) and the implementation period for a stream of funding (three years). The implementation periods remain fixed; and new money is added to the stream of funding whenever a new proposal is approved by the Global Fund.

This concept may take a little getting used to for people familiar with the old system – where a proposal covered a five-year period; funding was formally approved for the first two years; a request for funding was submitted and a Phase 2 review conducted; and funding was then formally approved for the remaining three years (or a portion thereof).

Table: Possible Implementation Schedule for a New Single Stream of Funding

Month Number	Actual Date	Event
Month 0	Dec. 2012	Agreement signed
Month 1	Jan. 2013	Start of first implementation period
Month 20	Aug. 2014	New funds added; agreement amended
Month 27	Mar. 2015	Applicant submits request for additional financial commitment for next implementation period; periodic review conducted
Month 30	Jun. 2015	Board approves request for additional financial commitment
By month 36	Dec. 2015	Agreement amended
Month 37	Jan. 2016	Start of second implementation period

Month 63	Mar. 2018	Applicant submits request for additional financial commitment for next implementation period; periodic review conducted
Month 66	Jun. 2018	Board approves request for additional financial commitment
By month 72	Dec. 2018	Agreement amended
Month 73	Jan. 2019	Start of third implementation period
etc.		
etc.		

Note: Because the agreement described in the above table was newly signed (in December 2012), the first periodic review will cover a period of only two years (Jan. 2013 to December 2014); each subsequent periodic review will cover a period of three year

How do you fit a five-year proposal into a three-year implementation period?

By the time proposals for Round 11 are approved, the Global Fund will be well on its way to implementing the new grant architecture. The word “grant” may still be around (as in “new grant architecture”), but what we now know as a “grant” will be called a “single stream of funding,” or maybe even “SSF” for short. And what we used to call a “grant agreement” will be called a “single-stream-of-funding agreement,” or maybe “SSF agreement” for short.

All proposals submitted for Round 11 have to be consolidated proposals. For all of the proposals approved in Round 11, single-stream-of-funding agreements will be signed with principal recipients (PRs). In most cases, a single-stream-of-funding agreement will cover not only new initiatives included in the proposal, but also all of the PR’s active “grants” for that disease (except perhaps for a grant that is about to expire). So, once the Round 11 single-stream-of-funding agreements have all been signed, there won’t be all that many “old” grants around with more than a few months left to run. By the time the Round 12 single-stream-of-funding agreements have all been signed, the old grant agreements will be an endangered species.

Under the new grant architecture:

- the single streams of funding may last indefinitely, providing new funds are approved periodically for that PR;
- implementation periods for each disease/HSS programme will last up to three years; and a periodic review will be conducted at the end of each implementation period;
- the periodic reviews will be conducted at the same time for all PRs implementing programmes for the disease or HSS programme in question;
- each applicant will submit a “request for additional financial commitment” (this used to be called “request for continued funding”) for the next implementation period about nine months prior to the end of the current implementation period;
- the Global Fund Board will decide whether to approve the request for additional financial commitment (and for what amount) about six months prior to the end of the current implementation period; and
- if the Board approves continued funding, an amendment to the single-stream-of-funding agreement will be negotiated and signed.

(For the balance of this article, we are assuming that the reference above to “up to three years” means, in fact, three years.)

The implementation periods remain fixed at three years, regardless of when new funds are approved for that PR. Let’s take the example of an HIV single-stream-of-funding agreement signed in December 2012 with PR A from Ruritania, a fictitious country, as a result of a Round 11 proposal having been approved.

Let's assume that this is the first HIV programme being managed by PR A. The implementation schedule for this agreement could look something like what is shown in the table below.

Table: Possible Implementation Schedule for a New Single Stream of Funding

Month Number	Actual Date	Event
Month 0	Dec. 2012	Agreement signed
Month 1	Jan. 2013	Start of first implementation period
Month 20	Aug. 2014	New funds added; agreement amended
Month 27	Mar. 2015	Applicant submits request for additional financial commitment for next implementation period; periodic review conducted
Month 30	Jun. 2015	Board approves request for additional financial commitment
By month 36	Dec. 2015	Agreement amended
Month 37	Jan. 2016	Start of second implementation period
Month 63	Mar. 2018	Applicant submits request for additional financial commitment for next implementation period; periodic review conducted
Month 66	Jun. 2018	Board approves request for additional financial commitment
By month 72	Dec. 2018	Agreement amended
Month 73	Jan. 2019	Start of third implementation period
etc.		
etc.		

Note: Because the agreement described in the above table was newly signed (in December 2012), the first periodic review will cover a period of only two years (Jan. 2013 to December 2014); each subsequent periodic review will cover a period of three years.

The table depicts the first six years (plus one month) of a new single-stream-of-funding agreement. It shows (in bold italics and also in red, unless you are looking at a black and white printout) an infusion of new money in Month 20. Let's assume that the new funds were added to PR A's stream of funding as a result of the Ruritania CCM having submitted a new five-year proposal and the Board having approved it. Since PR A's first implementation period was scheduled to end at Month 36, the Board initially formally approved funding for only the first 17 months of the proposal (corresponding to Months 20 through 36 of the implementation schedule). The next portion of funding from the new proposal would be formally approved (or not) when the CCM submitted its request for additional financial commitment for the second implementation period (in Month 27).

Note that at Month 20, when the first portion of funding from the new proposal was added, the single-stream-of-funding agreement was amended. The agreement is amended at each periodic review and each time new funding is added.

Thus, there is no correlation between the period covered by a proposal (up to five years) and the implementation period for a stream of funding (three years). The implementation periods remain fixed; and new money is added to the stream of funding whenever a new proposal is approved by the Global Fund.

This concept may take a little getting used to for people familiar with the old system – where a proposal covered a five-year period; funding was formally approved for the first two years; a request for funding was submitted and a Phase 2 review conducted; and funding was then formally approved for the remaining three years (or a portion thereof).

s.

The table depicts the first six years (plus one month) of a new single-stream-of-funding agreement. It shows (in bold italics and also in red, unless you are looking at a black and white printout) an infusion of new money in Month 20. Let's assume that the new funds were added to PR A's stream of funding as a result of the Ruritania CCM having submitted a new five-year proposal and the Board having approved it. Since PR A's first implementation period was scheduled to end at Month 36, the Board initially formally approved funding for only the first 17 months of the proposal (corresponding to Months 20 through 36 of the implementation schedule). The next portion of funding from the new proposal would be formally approved (or not) when the CCM submitted its request for additional financial commitment for the second implementation period (in Month 27).

Note that at Month 20, when the first portion of funding from the new proposal was added, the single-stream-of-funding agreement was amended. The agreement is amended at each periodic review and each time new funding is added.

Thus, there is no correlation between the period covered by a proposal (up to five years) and the implementation period for a stream of funding (three years). The implementation periods remain fixed; and new money is added to the stream of funding whenever a new proposal is approved by the Global Fund.

This concept may take a little getting used to for people familiar with the old system – where a proposal covered a five-year period; funding was formally approved for the first two years; a request for funding was submitted and a Phase 2 review conducted; and funding was then formally approved for the remaining three years (or a portion thereof).

[Read More](#)
