



Independent observer
of the Global Fund

Readers Provide Feedback on GFO

Aidspan survey finds that most respondents rate GFO highly, but many have suggestions for how it can be improved

Most readers of Global Fund Observer (GFO) who responded to a survey conducted by Aidspan are happy with the content, shape, style and quality of GFO. However, respondents said there is room for improvement in terms of the topics covered, the types of articles and the overall look of GFO.

These were some of the main findings of a survey conducted by Aidspan in the first half of 2011. More than 10% of subscribers provided feedback, a very high response rate for a survey. GFO has about 8,500 subscribers, up 15% over the past year and a half.

More than 90% of respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the statements that “GFO is helpful and practical to my work” and “GFO has increased my understanding of Global Fund issues.” A very high proportion (94%) of respondents agreed that GFO articles were “easy to understand.” About 83% of respondents indicated that they “always” or “sometimes” forward GFO to colleagues and friends.

Respondents said that GFO should produce more stories from the ground, including examples of good practice as well as comparative case studies of different grants and different countries. Respondents also asked for more analytical and academic articles related to the Global Fund.

In addition, respondents said that GFO should be available in more languages. (Editor’s note: Currently, GFO is available only in English; however, there are plans to expand to other languages.)

Among survey respondents, 52% were nationals of high-income countries versus 48% of middle- and low-income countries. However, 56% were physically located in middle- and low-income countries versus 44%

in high-income countries. (It is not known what the split was among subscribers who did not respond to the survey.) A majority of respondents were involved in Global Fund-related activities at the country level, mainly as implementers, technical consultants, members of country coordinating mechanisms (CCMs) and local fund agents (LFAs).

The questionnaire asked respondents whether they thought something similar to GFO was required for other global health institutions. More than two-thirds (68%) felt that other global health institutions needed to be monitored in the same way that GFO monitors the Global Fund.

A report on the survey findings has been prepared by Charles Marwa, Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer at Aidspace. Entitled, “What Readers Think about Global Fund Observer: Results from a survey conducted by Aidspace,” the report is available [here](#).

[Read More](#)
