The Aidspan Guide to Round 10 Applications to the Global Fund

Volume 1: Getting a Head Start

April 2010

by

David Garmaise
and Matthew Greenall

Table of Contents

Preface

Aidspan

Aidspan is an NGO originally based in New York, U.S. but, since mid-2007, based in Nairobi, Kenya. Its mission is to reinforce the effectiveness of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Aidspan performs this mission by serving as an independent watchdog of the Fund and its grant implementers through providing information and advice, facilitating critical debate, and promoting greater transparency, accountability, effectiveness and impact.

Aidspan also publishes the *Global Fund Observer (GFO)* newsletter, an independent email-based source of news, analysis and commentary about the Global Fund. To receive *GFO* at no charge, send an email to receive-gfo-newsletter@aidspan.org. The subject line and text area can be left blank.

Aidspan finances its work primarily through grants from foundations. Aidspan does not accept Global Fund money, perform paid consulting work or charge for any of its products.

Aidspan and the Global Fund maintain a positive working relationship, but have no formal connection. *The board, staff and other structures of the Global Fund have no influence on, and bear no responsibility for, the content of this report or of any other Aidspan publication.*

Acknowledgements, permissions, feedback

Aidspan thanks its funders for the support they have provided for 2003-2010 operations – The Monument Trust, Dr. Albert and Mrs. Monique Heijn, the Open Society Institute, Hivos, Irish Aid, the Foundation for the Treatment of Children with AIDS, the Norwegian Foreign Ministry, Merck & Co., UNAIDS, Anglo American, the Glaser Progress Foundation, the John M. Lloyd Foundation, the MAC AIDS Fund, GTZ, and two private donors.

David Garmaise, lead author of this guide, can be reached at garmaise@aidspan.org. Bernard Rivers, Executive Director of Aidspan, can be reached at rivers@aidspan.org. David Garmaise, who is based in Thailand, works half time as Aidspan's Senior Analyst. Over the last five years he has authored, co-authored or edited numerous Aidspan reports and guides.

Permission is granted to reproduce, print or quote from this guide, in whole or in part, if the following is stated: "Reproduced from *'The Aidspan Guide to Round 10 Applications to the Global Fund,'* available at www.aidspan.org/guides."

Aidspan publications

This guide is one of over a dozen free Aidspan publications written for those applying for, implementing or supporting grants from the Global Fund. The following is a partial list of Aidspan's publications.

- *Global Fund Observer:* A free email newsletter providing news, analysis and commentary to nearly 8,000 subscribers in 170 countries. (more than 118 issues over the past six years; currently available in English only)

- *Aidspan Report: Key Strengths of Rounds 8 and 9 Proposals to the Global Fund (January 2010;* available in English, French, Spanish and Russian)

- *A Beginner's Guide to the Global Fund* (July 2009; available in English, French, Spanish and Russian)

- ***The Aidspan Guide on the Roles and Responsibilities of CCMs in Grant Oversight*** (March 2009; available in English, French, Spanish and Russian)

- ***Aidspan Report: An Analysis of Global Fund Grant Ratings*** (November 2008; available in English only)

- ***Aidspan Report: Do Global Fund Grants Work for Women? An Assessment of the Gender Responsiveness of Global Fund-Financed Programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa*** (July 2008; available in English only)

- ***Aidspan White Paper: Scaling Up to Meet the Need: Overcoming Barriers to the Development of Bold Global Fund-Financed Programs*** (April 2008; available in English only)

- ***Aidspan White Paper: Providing Improved Technical Support to Enhance the Effectiveness of Global Fund Grants*** (March 2008; available in English only)

- ***The Aidspan Guide to Round 8 Applications to the Global Fund – Volume 2: The Applications Process and the Proposal Form*** (March 2008; available in English, French and Spanish)

- ***Aidspan Documents for In-Country Submissions*** (December 2007; available in English, French, Spanish and Russian)

- ***The Aidspan Guide to Building and Running an Effective Country Coordinating Mechanism (CCM)*** (Second edition September 2007; available in English, French and Spanish)

- ***The Aidspan Guide to Understanding Global Fund Processes for Grant Implementation – Volume 1: From Grant Approval to Signing the Grant Agreement*** (December 2005; originally titled "*The Aidspan Guide to Effective Implementation of Global Fund Grants."* Available in English only.)

- ***The Aidspan Guide to Understanding Global Fund Processes for Grant Implementation – Volume 2: From First Disbursement to Phase 2 Renewal*** (November 2007; available in English, French and Spanish)

Downloads

To download a copy of any of these publications, go to www.aidspan.org. If you do not have access to the web but you do have access to email, send a request to publications@aidspan.org specifying which publications you would like to receive as attachments to an email. Aidspan does not produce or distribute printed copies of these publications.

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

The following is a list of the most common abbreviations and acronyms used in this guide:

CBO	Community-based organisation
CCM	Country Coordinating Mechanism
CSO	Civil society organisation
DOTS	Directly observed therapy
FAQs	Frequently asked questions
FBO	Faith-based organisation
GDF	Global TB Drug Facility
GFO	Global Fund Observer
HSS	Health sector strengthening
IEC	Information, education and communication
LFA	Local Fund Agent
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
Non-CCM	Non-Country Coordinating Mechanism
PEPFAR	[U.S.] President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief
PLWHA	Person(s) living with HIV/AIDS
PR	Principal Recipient
PSM	Procurement and supply management
RCM	Regional Coordinating Mechanism
RO	Regional Organisation
SDA	Service delivery area
SR	Sub-Recipient
Sub-CCM	Sub-National Country Coordinating Mechanism
SWAp	Sector-Wide Approach
TB	Tuberculosis
TRP	Technical Review Panel
UNAIDS	United Nations Joint Programme on HIV and AIDS
UNICEF	United Nation's Children's Fund
VCT	Voluntary counselling and testing
WHO	World Health Organization

Chapter 1: Introduction and Background

This chapter describes the purpose of "The Aidspan Guide to Round 10 Applications to the Global Fund." The chapter also contains information on the contents of the guide, discusses the factors involved in deciding whether to apply, includes a note on terminology, and explains the importance of getting a head start on preparing Round 10 proposals.

Purpose of This Guide

The Aidspan Guide to Round 10 Applications to the Global Fund is intended to be useful both to those who need *less* than is provided in the proposal guidelines produced by the Global Fund (for example, because they may just want to find out whether they should even consider applying), and to those who need *more*.

The guide discusses factors that lie behind some of the questions asked in the "Proposal Form – Round 10" (hereinafter the "proposal form").

This guide is not intended to tell readers what they should say in their applications to the Global Fund. Rather, the objective is to de-mystify the application process and to provide a clearer idea of what is expected. The guide is based on the premise that there is no single "correct" way of completing the proposal form. It encourages applicants to clearly describe their plans to tackle HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis (TB), or malaria; and to make a convincing case that the plans are viable, capable of delivering the anticipated results, and something that the applicants are (a) committed to, and (b) capable of implementing.

This guide is very long. We suggest that readers use whatever parts they need, or use the guide as a reference tool, rather than trying to read it all in one session.

Once again, Aidspan is producing its applying guide in two volumes. "Volume 1: Getting a Head Start," (this document) provides information that applicants can use in the period before the Global Fund issues its call for proposals for Round 10. Some of the information in Volume 1 is generic and so could apply to any round of funding. "Volume 2: The Applications Process and the Proposal Form," provides guidance that is specific to the Round 10 applications process and proposal form.

Terminology Used in This Guide

Throughout this guide, the term "proposal" is used to describe the application that is being submitted to the Global Fund, and the term "programme" is used to describe the activities that will be implemented if the proposal is accepted for funding. The term "in-country submission" ("submission" for short) is used to describe mini-proposals that in-country stakeholders may submit for possible inclusion in a CCM proposal.

The term "NGO" refers to non-governmental organisations – i.e., not-for-profit organisations that operate outside the government sphere. Community-based organisations (CBOs) are one type of NGO. For the purposes of this guide, references to "NGOs" generally include CBOs.

The Global Fund identifies five types of proposal, categorized by source:

- Country Coordinating Mechanism (CCM)
- Sub-National Country Coordinating Mechanism (Sub-CCM)

- Regional Coordinating Mechanism (RCM)
- Regional Organisation (RO)
- Non-Country Coordinating Mechanism (Non-CCM)

At times, the Global Fund uses the term "CCM" to include not only CCMs, but also Sub-CCMs and RCMs. This can be confusing, but the context usually makes the meaning clear. The Global Fund also uses the term "coordinating mechanism" to denote CCMs, Sub-CCMs and RCMs. In this guide, we also use this term in this fashion.

The Global Fund uses the term "Non-CCM" to refer to proposals submitted by in-country organisations other than the CCM and Sub-CCM. In this guide, we also use this term in this fashion.

Note, also, that the Global Fund tends to use the terms "CCM" and "national CCM" interchangeably. In this guide, we generally use only "CCM," unless we are quoting or paraphrasing from other sources.

Contents of This Guide (Volume 1)

The remainder of **Chapter 1** discusses the factors that potential applicants should consider in deciding whether to apply for a Round 10 grant, and explains why it is important to start working on Round 10 proposals before the Global Fund formally issues its call for proposals.

Chapter 2: General Information describes what kinds of initiatives the Global Fund will support, whether there are restrictions on the size of grants, and what the criteria are concerning who is eligible to apply. The chapter provides information on the applications process, the criteria used to review proposals, and where applicants can obtain advice concerning the technical content of their proposals. The chapter also discusses factors that should be considered in deciding whether to submit a Non-CCM proposal, a regional proposal, or a Sub-CCM proposal. In addition, the chapter explains the implications for Round 10 of the new funding architecture adopted by the Global Fund; describes where changes might be expected on the Round 10 proposal form; and provides a list of relevant documents that the Global Fund recommends applicants read before completing their applications.

Chapter 3: The Proposal Development Process provides guidance on how to design and implement a proposal development process for Round 10. It discusses a number of issues that CCMs should consider when deciding how to go about developing their proposals. The chapter also provides some specific input on how to manage a process for soliciting and reviewing submissions for the overall proposal, an area on which the Global Fund has established requirements but has provided little guidance.

Note: Except where stated otherwise, this guide assumes that the reader is representing a CCM that is considering applying to the Global Fund during Round 10.

Deciding Whether to Apply

Deciding whether or not to apply for a Round 10 grant from the Global Fund should be based on one or more of the following considerations:

- If you had a proposal that was submitted in a previous round of funding but not approved, this may be the appropriate time to resurrect the proposal and correct the weaknesses identified by the TRP.

- If you have identified gaps in your current programmes for HIV/AIDS, TB, or malaria, you may want to submit an application to address these gaps.

- If you have a Global Fund-financed programme that will be completed very shortly, you may want to develop a new proposal that will continue or advance the work of this programme. In appropriate instances, this may involve scaling up what was initially a pilot project.

You will also need to determine whether your CCM, Sub-CCM or RCM meets all of the mandatory requirements established by the Global Fund. See "Who Is Eligible to Apply to the Global Fund" in Chapter 2: General Information for more details.

In addition, you will need to determine whether the type of programme you are planning falls within the parameters of what the Global Fund is prepared to support. The Global Fund finances a wide range of activities to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. For more information, see "What Initiatives Will the Global Fund Support?" in Chapter 2: General Information.

Furthermore, you will need to decide whether you will be ready in time to submit a solid application (see the next section).

Finally, if you are submitting a regional proposal, you will also need to build in time for consultations with the national CCMs in the region. See "Deciding Whether to Submit a Regional Proposal" in Chapter 2: General Information.

The Importance of Getting a Head Start

Work on an application for a Global Fund grant should start well in advance of the Fund's call for proposals for any given round of funding.

The Round 10 call for proposals is expected to be launched in May 2010 and close in August 2010. When we went to press, the precise launch and closing dates were not known. In all likelihood, applicants will only have three months in which to submit a proposal, down from four months for Rounds 8 and 9.

Applicants will need most of this three-month period to fill out what has always been a rather complicated proposal form, and to obtain the necessary approvals and signatures. For this reason, and because the Global Fund requires that applicants engage in a process of soliciting and reviewing in-country submissions for possible inclusion in the country coordinated proposal, Aidspan recommends that applicants begin working on their proposals at least a few months ahead of the call for proposals.

Ideally, events should happen in the following order:

1. A country determines its national *strategy* for tackling HIV/AIDS, TB, or malaria.

2. The country then designs one or more *programmes* designed to implement that strategy.

3. The country then submits *proposals* (to places such as the Global Fund) seeking financial support for one or more of those programmes.

Thus, when CCMs prepare a proposal to the Global Fund, they should, in theory, be in a position to describe a national strategy and a programme, both of which have already been designed. If the main elements of the programme are already developed by the time the application forms become available, writing the proposal becomes much easier.

But all too often, what actually happens is that applicants use the proposal form and the applications process to design their programme – and in some cases to design the national strategy. We think that this is a case of the "tail wagging the dog," and that it often results in inferior proposals.

CCMs need to have sufficient time for the whole exercise – time enough to ensure that the national strategy and programme design are clear, to solicit and review in-country submissions, to write the proposal, to get the proposal endorsed by the CCM as a whole, and to get it signed by individual CCM members.

Chapter 2: General Information

This chapter describes what kinds of initiatives the Global Fund will support; discusses whether there are restrictions on the size of grants; outlines the criteria concerning who is eligible to apply; briefly reviews the applications process; and lists the criteria used to review proposals. The chapter also includes sections on deciding whether to submit a Non-CCM proposal, a regional proposal, or a Sub-CCM proposal. In addition, the chapter provides information on where applicants can obtain advice concerning the technical content of their proposals. Finally, the chapter explains the implications for Round 10 of the new funding architecture adopted by the Global Fund; describes where changes might be expected on the Round 10 proposal form; and provides a list of relevant documents that the Global Fund recommends applicants read before completing their applications.

Special Note:

This chapter refers extensively to documents prepared by the Global Fund for the ninth round of funding, particularly the "Guidelines for Proposals: Round 9," but also the Round 9 proposal form. The Global Fund is not expected to release similar documents for Round 10 until it formally issues its call for proposals in May 2010. Because Aidspan wanted to release Volume 1 of this guide well in advance of the call for proposals, we have relied on the Round 9 documents. However, with respect to most of the topics covered in this chapter, we do not expect that the Global Fund's Round 10 documents will differ significantly from its Round 9 documents.

What Initiatives Will the Global Fund Support?

The Global Fund supports a wide range of initiatives in the fight against HIV /AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. The following is an extract from the Global Fund's "Guidelines for Proposals – Round 9," (hereinafter the R9 Guidelines for Proposals):[1]

> Set out below is information on possible disease program interventions…. Importantly, [this] is not an exhaustive list of all activities/interventions that may be funded…. *Disease focused activities* may include, but are not limited to, the following:
>
> - Behavior change interventions, such as peer education;
>
> - Activities to reduce girls' and women's vulnerability to the three diseases, such as equitable access to youth and social safety net programs, prevention and mitigation of sexual violence, and advocacy for legal change and enforcement;
>
> - Community outreach, including preventive measures focusing on *key affected populations;*
>
> - Blood safety and safe injection interventions to prevent medical transmission;
>
> - Male circumcision, with the assurance of a comprehensive package of prevention messages and activities and access to counseling and testing services;
>
> - Community-based programs aimed at alleviating the impact of the diseases, including programs directed at women, orphans, vulnerable children and adolescents; and alleviating the burden of care and support on, especially, women;

---

[1] The full text of the R9 Guidelines for Proposals is available via www.theglobalfund.org/en/rounds/9. Note that there are separate guidelines for single- and multi-country applicants.

- Community systems strengthening to improve implementation and service delivery, including strengthening core institutional capacity through physical infrastructure development, and organizational and systems strengthening;

- Partnership building at the community level, focusing on the building of systematized relationships among and between community based organizations at the local level to improve coordination, build upon one another's skills and abilities, and enhance service delivery outcomes in respect of the disease(s);

- Operational research to improve program performance, including determining effective ways to increase demand for, and improve access to, quality services;

- Home and palliative care support;

- Interventions related to interactions between the three diseases, including providing access to prevention services through integrated health services, especially for women and adolescents through reproductive health care;

- Provision and/or scale up of critical health products and health equipment to prevent, diagnose, and treat the three diseases, including the introduction of previously unavailable treatments;

- Workplace programs for prevention, and to care for and/or treat employees, including policy development in regard to such programs;

- Co-investment schemes to expand private sector programs to surrounding communities; and

- The establishment and ongoing support of interventions managed by people living with and/or affected by HIV, tuberculosis and/or malaria, such as support groups, treatment literacy programs, and risk-reduction programs.

However, the Global Fund does not provide funding for:

- Basic science research and clinical research aimed at demonstrating the safety and efficacy of new drugs and vaccines; or

- Large scale capital investments such as building hospitals or clinics.

Resources from the Global Fund can also be used to support the strengthening of health systems linked to reducing the impact and spread of any of the three diseases. In fact, both the Fund and other organisations are strongly encouraging applicants to include health systems strengthening activities in their proposals.

Are There Any Restrictions on the Amount of Funding Applicants May Apply for?

There are no rules concerning the size of the budgets contained in proposals to the Global Fund. The following is an extract from the R9 Guidelines for Proposals:

> There are no fixed upper limits on the size of a proposal, and the size of proposals may vary considerably based on country context and type of proposal. Applicants are reminded that demonstrated evidence of sufficient absorptive capacity is an important criterion for additional financial support from the Global Fund. The TRP may view negatively proposals that request large amounts where the ability to absorb such funding has not been demonstrated, through existing capacity or through planned capacity strengthening (including via the Round 9 proposal).

> There are also no fixed lower limits on the size of a proposal. However, as the Global Fund promotes comprehensive programs and particularly those aimed at scaling-up proven interventions, the TRP may view negatively requests for small programs (of the order of several hundred thousand US Dollars or below). Smaller requests by individual partners

and/or smaller non-governmental organizations should be aggregated into the overall single disease proposal.

Who is Eligible to Apply to the Global Fund?

In the first nine rounds of funding, the vast majority of proposals screened in by the Global Fund Secretariat and sent to the TRP for review have emanated from CCMs. Nevertheless, a few applications from Sub-CCMs, RCMs, ROs and Non-CCMs have been approved in Rounds 1-9; applications from these other sources are discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

To be eligible for funding, applicants have to meet certain criteria (though not all criteria apply to all applicant types). These criteria are described in detail in the R9 Guidelines for Proposals. In this section, we provide a summary of the criteria, divided into two categories:

- Technical eligibility
- Functioning of the coordinating mechanism

Technical Eligibility

The Global Fund provides grants to help developing countries tackle HIV/AIDS, TB, and malaria. Organisations from countries classified by the World Bank as "low income," "lower-middle income," and "upper-middle income" are eligible to apply.[2] Organisations from high-income countries are not eligible to apply.

Historically, the World Bank publishes its income level classifications annually. Therefore, although the R9 Guidelines for Proposals contained a list of countries broken down by income level, there is no guarantee that the list will remain unchanged for Round 10. Therefore, potential applicants should consult the list of countries in the Round 10 Guidelines for Proposals when they are released (expected in May 2010.)
.
There are no conditions attached to applications from organisations from low income countries. However, organisations from lower-middle income countries and upper-middle income countries have to meet certain criteria. The conditions that organisations classified as lower-middle income and upper-middle income have to meet concern cost sharing, a focus on poor or vulnerable communities, and a high-disease burden.

Cost sharing

Cost sharing involves a calculation of the relative proportion of the overall need that will be funded from (a) national resources and (b) external resources. Proposals from lower-middle income countries must demonstrate that at least 35 percent of the national need for a disease programme over the proposal term will come from national resources. For proposals from upper-middle income countries, the proportion that must come from national resources is at least 65 percent. .Non-CCM applicants are exempt from the cost-sharing requirements.

---

[2] The R9 Guidelines for Proposals state that RCM and Regional Organization applicants must demonstrate that a simple majority of 51% of the countries included in the Round 9 proposal would have been eligible to apply as single-country applicants.

Focus on poor or vulnerable populations

Proposals from lower- and upper-middle income countries must demonstrate a focus on poor or vulnerable populations. The proposals have to specify which poor and vulnerable populations are being targeted, explain how and why they were identified, and describe how they will be involved in planning and implementing the proposal.

High disease burden

Organisations from upper-middle income countries are eligible to apply only if they can demonstrate that their country faces a high current national disease burden either in the general population or in an identified vulnerable group.[3]

Part C of Annex 1 to the R9 Guidelines for Proposals lists the upper-middle-income countries that were eligible to apply for Round 9, as well as the disease components that could be included in their proposals. Potential applicants from upper-middle-income countries should check the R10 Guidelines for Proposals when they are released to determine whether they are eligible to apply for Round 10.

Functioning of the Coordinating Mechanism

There are certain requirements that a CCM must meet in order for its proposal to be eligible for funding.[4] These requirements relate to having a broad and inclusive membership, documenting procedures for the management of conflict of interest, and developing and documenting transparent processes for certain of the CCM's responsibilities.

NOTE: THESE REQUIREMENTS ALSO APPLY TO SUB- CCMS AND RCMS.

> **CCM requirements: How much flexibility?**
>
> Since the CCM requirements described in this section were adopted (a few months before the Round 5 Call for Proposals), the Global Fund Secretariat, which screens all proposals for eligibility, has exercised a certain amount of discretion in applying the requirements – up until Round 9 at least. Whereas only six CCMs were deemed ineligible in Rounds 6, 7 and 8 combined, in Round 9 alone seven CCMs were screened out. This suggests that the Secretariat has become more rigourous in its application of the minimum requirements.

Broad and inclusive membership

The Global Fund requires that the membership of the CCM include people living with or affected by the three diseases (HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria). In practice, this has been interpreted to mean that the CCM must include people *living with* HIV/AIDS or TB (or, in the case of malaria, representatives of any community or civil society group working in, or affected by, the disease).

The Global Fund recommends that at least 40 percent of the membership of the CCM be from non-governmental sectors – i.e., from the academic or educational sector, NGOs, and religious and faith-based organisations (FBOs), persons living with or affected by the three diseases, and key affected populations – collectively referred to as civil society – and from the private sector and in-country multi- and bi-lateral development partners. Although the 40

---

[3] Some Small Island Developing States are eligible to apply regardless of the disease burden. See Part C of Annex 1 of the R9 Guidelines for Proposals.

[4] The requirements are described in the Fund's "*Guidelines and Requirement for Country Coordinating Mechanisms* ," available under "CCM Guidelines and Requirements" at www.theglobalfund.org/en/rounds/9.

percent threshold is a not a requirement per se, the Global Fund nevertheless wants to see evidence of a broad-based CCM that reflects a partnership among all relevant stakeholders.

Managing conflicts of interest

To avoid conflicts of interest, the Global Fund recommends that the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of CCMs not be from the same entity that the CCM nominates to act as the Principal Recipient (PR) for the proposal. If, however, the Chair or Vice-Chair is from the same entity as the nominated PR, then the Fund requires that CCMs have in place a transparent, written plan to mitigate the inherent conflict of interest.

Transparent processes

The Global Fund requires that CCMs develop and document fair and transparent processes to:

- broadly solicit submissions for possible integration into one consolidated country proposal;
- review all qualitatively sound submissions received for integration into the proposal prior to sending the proposal to the Global Fund;
- nominate a technically capable PR;
- oversee programme implementation; and
- ensure the input of a broad range of stakeholders, including CCM members and non-members, in the proposal development and grant-oversight process.

The Global Fund says that the proposal development process should also allow all sectors and constituencies (both CCM members and non-members) enough time to provide input into the drafting of the proposal to be submitted to the Global Fund.

The Global Fund also requires that the CCM share a broad range of information about the proposal process to *all* stakeholders actively involved in the diseases, including nongovernmental stakeholders and constituencies in the community. Information that is expected to be publicly shared by the CCM before the proposal is developed includes:

- the timing relevant to the Global Fund's Call for Proposals;
- how interested stakeholders may provide the CCM with a submission to be considered for inclusion in the CCM's consolidated country proposal to the Global Fund;
- the criteria upon which submissions will be evaluated by the CCM for possible inclusion in the proposal;
- and other guidance believed relevant (e.g., information on items such as national priorities for each of the three diseases, updated disease burden statistics, and perceived gaps in existing services being provided to most at risk groups).

In its proposal, the CCM must provide evidence that it meets all of these requirements.

Description of the Applications Process

For each round of funding, the Global Fund Secretariat announces a call for proposals. For Round 10, the call is expected to come in May 2010. Proposals may be submitted in any of the six U.N. languages: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian or Spanish. Because the

reviews will be conducted in English, the Secretariat encourages applicants who submit proposals in a language other than English to provide an English translation. However, this is not a requirement. If no English translation is provided, the Secretariat will arrange for translation.

The Secretariat will review all proposals for completeness and to ensure that they meet the eligibility criteria. The Secretariat may contact applicants for clarifications. Eligible proposals are passed on to the TRP for consideration. For Round 10, the TRP will review the proposals about two months prior to the Global Fund Board meeting which is expected to take place in December 2010, and will make recommendations to the Board.

If an applicant submits a proposal for more than one disease, each disease component will be reviewed separately by the TRP. (In effect, each disease component becomes a separate proposal.) In Round 10, for the first time, the TRP will be able to recommend approval conditional on the removal of a limited set of elements. Previously, the TRP had to recommend approval or rejection based on the entire proposal (with the exception of cross-cutting health systems strengthening components.)

In addition to reviewing the actual proposal, the TRP also considers a broad range of other information, such as performance of existing Global Fund grants and information provided by technical partners (including, where available, UNAIDS, the World Health Organization [WHO] and the World Bank). It draws on the individual expertise of its own members. Previous TRP comments on weaknesses in proposals submitted in earlier rounds are also taken into consideration.

The TRP

The TRP is an independent team of experts appointed by the Global Fund Board to objectively review proposals. The TRP is made up of up to 40 experts in health and development, with a mixture of expertise in HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and health systems strengthening. Each person is appointed for a period of four rounds of funding. TRP members are selected from hundreds of nominees submitted from around the world. Members are drawn from governmental and non-governmental organisations, from the developed and developing worlds, and from the public and private sectors. When the TRP members review the proposals, they do so in their personal capacities – they do not share the information with, or accept any instructions from, their employers or their national governments.

A list of current TRP members is available at www.theglobalfund.org/en/trp/members/.

Once the TRP has assessed each proposal, it will assign it a rating in one of the following categories:

- **Recommended (Category 1)**: Proposals recommended by the TRP for approval, for which the TRP seeks no clarifications or only minor ones.

- **Recommended (Category 2):** Proposals recommended by the TRP for approval subject to the applicant satisfactorily responding to a number of requests by the TRP for clarification. Usually, Category 2 is divided into Categories 2A and 2B, with "2B" being reserved for weaker proposals. This distinction comes into play when there are insufficient resources to fund all recommended proposals (see below).

- **Not Recommended (Category 3)**: Proposals not recommended by the TRP in their present form, but regarding which applicants are encouraged to submit improved applications in future rounds.

- **Not Recommended (Category 4):** Proposals not recommended by the TRP for funding, and regarding which the TRP provides no encouragement with respect to re-applying in future rounds.

In allocating each proposal to one of the above categories, the TRP takes into consideration only technical factors, such as whether the programme described in the proposal is technically sound, whether it is one that the specified organisation(s) are capable of implementing, and whether it represents good use of the money. The TRP is required to ignore the question of whether it believes the Global Fund has enough money to pay for all of the proposals that it is recommending. If the TRP recommends more proposals than the Fund has money to finance, it is up to the Board to deal with the problem.

Table 2.1 shows that in the first nine rounds of funding, 42% of eligible proposals were recommended by the TRP for approval (i.e., were classified as Category 1 or 2).

Table 2.1 – Recommendation Rates for Rounds 1-9

Round		No. of eligible proposals	% Recom- mended
1	Submitted	204	
	Recommended for approval	58	28%
2	Submitted	229	
	Recommended for approval	98	43%
3	Submitted	180	
	Recommended for approval	71	39%
4	Submitted	173	
	Recommended for approval	69	40%
5	Submitted	202	
	Recommended for approval	63	31%
6	Submitted	196	
	Recommended for approval	85	43%
7	Submitted	150	
	Recommended for approval	73	49%
8	Submitted	174	
	Recommended for approval	94	54%
9	Submitted	159	
	Recommended for approval	85	53%
Total	Submitted	1,667	
	Recommended for approval	696	42%

The Global Fund Board makes the final decision concerning which proposals will be funded. The Board approves grants based on two factors: (a) the technical merits of the proposal, and (b) the availability of funds. For Round 10, the Board will review the TRP recommendations and make decisions at its last meeting of 2010, expected to occur in December.

In the first nine rounds of funding, the Board established the impressive precedent of approving all Category 1 and 2 proposals without going through them on a proposal-by-proposal basis. Clearly, there were some Category 1 or 2 proposals that some board members did not like, or that came from countries with governments that some board members did not like. But the Board de-politicized the process – and thus avoided potentially endless arguing – by following the advice of the TRP.

In Rounds 1 and 2, this process was rendered easier by the fact that the Fund had plenty of "start-up" funds available. However, in Rounds 3 and 4 there was only just enough money available. In Round 5, it was far from certain that there would be enough money available to pay for all Category 1 and 2 proposals (and, indeed, approval of some proposals was delayed for a short time). In Rounds 8 and 9, the Board had to delay formal approval of some of the recommended proposals for up to several months while waiting for sufficient funding to become available. This may happen again in Round 10.

In 2004, the Global Fund Board adopted a policy concerning how to proceed in a situation where there is not enough money available to cover costs for the first two years of all proposals recommended by the TRP. See the box on the next page for a description of this policy.

There is an Internal Appeal Mechanism that allows applicants whose proposals were rejected in two consecutive rounds to appeal the second decision. Information on the criteria and process for internal appeals can be found at www.theglobalfund.org/en/trp/appeals/.

Once a proposal is approved (as Category 1 or 2), the Secretariat enters into a lengthy and complex process of: (a) ensuring that the applicant answers, to the satisfaction of the TRP, any questions that the TRP asked regarding the proposal (this is known as the "TRP clarifications process"); (b) assessing the ability of the proposed PR to perform the role that the proposal assigns to it; and (c) negotiating a grant agreement with the PR.[5] The process takes many months. Only after it is completed is the first cash disbursement made. Thus, although proposals have to be submitted by the (likely) August 2010 deadline, it is unlikely that funding for a successful proposal will be made available before the middle of 2011.

It should be noted that occasionally, proposals have become "un-approved" when the TRP has concluded that its queries were not responded to adequately or in time.

To assess the ability of the PR, the Global Fund contracts with a Local Fund Agent (LFA) in the country in question. The LFA certifies the financial management and administrative capacity of the nominated PR. Based on the LFA assessment, the Fund may decide that the PR requires technical support (TS) to strengthen its capacities.

The Secretariat and the PR then negotiate a grant agreement, which identifies specific measurable results to be tracked using a set of key indicators. (If the LFA assessment identified that capacity building of the PR is required, then the grant agreement may specify that funds will not be disbursed until the capacity building is done.)

Each successful proposal is approved in principle for up to five years, but funding is only committed by the Board for the first two years. Funding for Years 3-5 will be approved – or not – during the second year of programme implementation. (This is known as the "Phase 2 renewal process.") Whether renewed funding is approved will depend on performance in implementing the first two years of the grant.

After the grant agreement is signed, the Secretariat will ask the World Bank (the Global Fund's banker) to make an initial disbursement to the PR. The PR then makes disbursements to Sub-Recipients (SRs), the main implementers of the programme. Once disbursements have commenced, programmes and services can begin.

---

[5] The assessment of the PR, and the negotiation of the grant agreement, will be started while the TRP clarifications process is underway.

> ### Global Fund policy on how to proceed when insufficient financing Is available
>
> In 2004, the Global Fund board adopted a policy that will be applied in situations where the money available is not sufficient to finance the first two years of all grants recommended for approval by the TRP. (Note that paying for Years 3-5 of existing grants – i.e., grant renewals – will take priority over paying for Years 1-2 of new grants. Thus, there is an increased chance of insufficient funds being available to finance new grants given that extensive grant renewals are now taking place.) When insufficient financing is available, the board will proceed as follows:
>
> - If possible, finance all proposals in TRP Category 1, then all proposals in Category 2A, then all proposals in Category 2B.
>
> - If there is not enough money to finance all proposals in a particular category, assign all proposals in that category a score from 1-8 based on the country's disease burden and poverty level. Proposals from countries with a "very high" disease burden (see definition earlier in this chapter) get four points, and those from any other eligible country get one point. And proposals from countries defined as "low income" by the World Bank get four points, proposals from "lower middle income" countries two points, and proposals from "upper middle income" countries zero points. Thus, each proposal gets either four points or one point based on disease burden; plus four, two or zero points based on poverty level. Total possible points are 8, 6, 5, 4, 3, or 1.
>
> - If possible, finance all those proposals that have eight points. Then, if possible, finance all those that have six points. Then, all those that have five points. And so on, until there is a score which cannot be fully financed.
>
> **Note: This policy is currently under review and may be changed for Round 10.**

Additional Information on the Applications Process

The Global Fund suggests that prior to submitting a proposal, applicants should read the Template Standard Grant Agreement so that they are familiar with the terms and conditions upon which the Global Fund will provide funds if the proposal is approved.[6] By "applicants," the Fund means both the members of coordinating mechanisms and nominated PRs (or, in the case of RO and Non-CCM applicants, the directors of the organisation).

The Global Fund advises applicants that all information in all proposals submitted to the Global Fund may be publicly disclosed on the Global Fund website or through other means. Starting with Round 7, the Global Fund has been posting copies of both successful and unsuccessful proposals.

In addition, the Global fund advises that if a proposal is approved and a grant agreement signed, all grant progress reports will be made public. This applies to both financial and programmatic information, and includes information on the price of drugs and other health products.

---

[6] A copy of the template can be obtained at
www.aidspan.org/index.php?page=implementation&menu=publications.

What Criteria Are Used to Review Proposals?

The R9 Guidelines for Proposals list the criteria that the TRP used to review proposals submitted for Round 9 and screened in by the Global Fund Secretariat. Applicants should familiarise themselves with these criteria before preparing their proposals. The criteria may change for Round 10, but the changes are unlikely to be substantial. According to the criteria, the TRP looks for proposals that demonstrate the following characteristics:

Soundness of approach:
- Use of interventions consistent with international best practices (as outlined in the Stop TB Strategy, the Roll Back Malaria Global Strategic Plan, the WHO Global Health-Sector Strategy for HIV/AIDS and other WHO and UNAIDS strategies and guidance) to increase service coverage for the region in which the interventions are proposed, and demonstrate a potential to achieve impact;
- Give due priority to groups and communities most affected and/or at risk, including by strengthening the participation of communities and people infected and affected by the three diseases in the development and implementation of proposals;
- Demonstrate that interventions chosen are evidence-based and represent good value for money;
- Involve a broad range of stakeholders in implementation, including strengthening partnerships between government, civil society, affected communities, and the private sector;
- Address issues of human rights and gender equality, including contributing to the elimination of stigmatization of and discrimination against those infected and affected by tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS, especially women, children, and other vulnerable groups; and
- Are consistent with national law and applicable international obligations, such as those arising under World Trade Organization's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (the TRIPS Agreement), including the Doha Ministerial Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, and encourage efforts to make quality drugs and products available at the lowest possible prices for those in need while respecting the protection of intellectual property rights.

Feasibility:
- Provide strong evidence of the technical and programmatic feasibility of implementation arrangements relevant in the specific country context, including where appropriate, supporting decentralized interventions and/or participatory approaches (including those involving the public, private and non-government sectors, and communities affected by the diseases) to disease prevention and control;
- Build on, complement, and coordinate with existing programs (including those supported by existing Global Fund grants) in support of national policies, plans, priorities and partnerships, including National Health Sector Development Plans, Poverty Reduction Strategies and sector-wide approaches (where appropriate);
- Demonstrate successful implementation of programs previously funded by international donors (including the Global Fund), and, where relevant, efficient disbursement and use of funds. (For this purpose, the TRP will make use of Grant Score Cards, Grant Performance Reports and other documents related to previous grant(s) in respect of Global Fund supported programs);
- Utilize innovative approaches to scaling up programs, such as through the involvement of the private sector and/or affected communities as caregivers;
- Identify in respect of previous proposals for the same component submitted to the Global Fund but not approved, how this proposal addresses any weaknesses or matters for clarification that were raised by the TRP;
- Focus on performance by linking resources (inputs) to the achievement of outputs (people reached with key services) and outcomes (longer term changes in the disease), as measured by qualitative and quantitative indicators;

- Demonstrate how the proposed interventions are appropriate to the stage of the epidemic and to the specific epidemiological situation in the country (including issues such as drug resistance); and
- Build on and strengthen country impact measurement systems and processes to ensure effective performance based reporting and evaluation; and
- Identify and address potential gaps in technical and managerial capacities in relation to the implementation of the proposed activities through the provision of technical assistance and capacity building.

Potential for sustainability and impact:
- Strengthen and reflect high-level, sustained political involvement and commitment, including through an inclusive and well-governed CCM, Sub-CCM or RCM;
- Demonstrate that Global Fund financing will be additional to existing efforts to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, rather than replacing them;
- Demonstrate the potential for the sustainability of the approach outlined, including addressing the capacity to absorb increased resources and the ability to absorb recurrent expenditures;
- Coordinate with multilateral and bilateral initiatives and partnerships (such as the WHO/UNAIDS "Universal Access" initiative, the Stop TB Partnership, the Roll Back Malaria Partnership, the "Three Ones" principles1 and UNICEF's "Unite for Children. Unite against AIDS" campaign) towards the achievement of outcomes targeted by National Health Sector Development Plans (where they exist);
- Demonstrate that the proposal will contribute to reducing overall disease, prevalence, incidence, morbidity and/or mortality; and
- Demonstrate how the proposal will contribute to strengthening the national health system in its different components (e.g., human resources, service delivery, infrastructure, procurement and supply management).

Deciding Whether to Submit a Non-CCM Proposal

The Global Fund prefers that all applications come from CCMs, Sub-CCMs, RCMs and ROs. The Fund strongly discourages applications from other organisations. The Global Fund refers to applications from other organisations as "Non-CCM" proposals; see the Note on Terminology in Chapter 1: Introduction for an explanation. Although, in theory, proposals from Non-CCMs can be submitted by organisations from any sector, in practice a large majority of such proposals have emanated from NGOs and FBOs.

The main reason the Global Fund discourages proposals from individual NGOs and FBOs is that the Fund wants to promote partnerships among the stakeholders. Another reason is that the Fund does not want to be swamped with multiple applications from one country, with objectives pointing in different directions. But some proposals from NGOs were funded in the first nine rounds, and there may be circumstances where NGOs or FBOs could consider submitting a proposal in Round 10.

What the Global Fund Guidelines Say

The R9 Guidelines for Proposals and proposal form state that Non-CCM proposals can be considered if they can demonstrate that the main justification for submitting a Non-CCM proposal is one of the following:

- country that is without a national government, and that is not being administered by a recognised interim administration;

- country in conflict, facing a natural disaster, or in a complex emergency situation; or

- country that suppresses, or has not established, partnerships with civil society and NGOs (including a country in which the CCM has unreasonably failed or refused to

consider a submission from a civil society organisation, through the CCM's established submissions process, for inclusion in the CCM's national proposal).

The guidelines state that a Non-CCM proposal must demonstrate clearly why it could not be considered under the CCM process, and provide documentation of these reasons. The guidelines further state that if a Non-CCM proposal was provided to a CCM for its consideration, but the CCM either did not review it in a timely fashion or unreasonably refused to include it in the national proposal, the steps taken to obtain CCM approval should be described; and arguments in support of the CCM endorsement, as well as documentary evidence of the attempts to obtain CCM approval, should be provided.

For further information, consult Section 2.4.2 of the R9 Guidelines for Proposals.

Experience in Previous Rounds of Funding

For the most part, in the first nine rounds of funding, proposals from Non-CCMs have been funded only in very limited circumstances – i.e., either there was no CCM in existence in the country; or the country or region was torn apart by war (or both). (A significant number of NGOs and FBOs submit proposals each round, but the vast majority of them are deemed ineligible and are screened out by the Global Fund Secretariat.)

In Round 1, when many CCMs were still being formed, the Global Fund approved four proposals from NGOs. In Round 2, two proposals were approved from NGOs in Madagascar where, at the time, there was no CCM in existence. However, because a CCM was in the process of being formed in Madagascar, the Global Fund stipulated in its grant agreements for these programmes that once the CCM was formed, the CCM must oversee the implementation of the programmes.

In Round 3, the Fund approved a proposal from an NGO in Russia, where, at the time, there was no CCM in existence. In Rounds 3 and 4, the Global Fund approved proposals from NGOs in Somalia and Côte d'Ivoire, two war-torn countries. (The NGO for the Somalia proposal was an International NGO.) In Round 5, the Global Fund approved a proposal from an NGO in Côte d'Ivoire. In each of Rounds 6 and 7, the Fund approved a Non-CCM proposal from Somalia. In Round 7, the Fund approved a Non-CCM proposal covering the West Bank and Gaza.

There have only been two instances of proposals from an NGO being funded outside the circumstances described above. One was a proposal to provide prevention services to injection drug users in Thailand that was funded in Round 3. Several factors made this situation unique:

- The government was not funding prevention activities targeting injection drug users.

- A military and police crackdown on drug traffickers and individual drug users was underway.

- The NGO submitting the proposal said that it had been informed that some members of the CCM would not support any proposal that included prevention programmes for injection drug users.

The second instance was a Round 5 proposal from a group of NGOs in the Russian Federation. Again the target audience was injection drug users. Previous proposals from the CCM in that country had not targeted injection drugs users, and the CCM was not planning on submitting a proposal for Round 5. The TRP agreed that the proposal from the NGOs addressed clear service gaps and met "a clear and compelling need."

The Bottom Line

For Round 10, therefore, we suggest that Non-CCMs consider submitting a proposal only:

- if they are working in a country or region severely affected by war or natural disasters; or
- if they are working in a country where services are not being provided to a particular vulnerable group, and the existing CCM has indicated that it is not prepared to submit a proposal that addresses this population.

In all other cases, NGOs, FBOs (and other organisations) are best advised to work through the CCM. As indicated in the previous section, exactly how NGOs and FBOs become involved in the applications process will depend on the process that the CCM uses to prepare proposals. It may also depend on the degree of satisfaction that NGOs have with this process. If an NGO or FBO is unhappy with the process, one option it might consider is to prepare a proposal and then attempt to get the CCM to adopt it as its own proposal.

Deciding Whether to Submit a Regional Proposal

In previous rounds of funding, only a small number of regional proposals were approved. Regional proposals can originate from two sources: RCMs and ROs.

RCMs

Multiple countries with existing functional CCMs may form an RCM to submit a coordinated regional proposal to address common issues among countries, including cross-border interventions. The Global Fund says that membership of the RCM should be drawn from a broad range of sources, such as the national CCM membership of each of the countries and other stakeholders and sectors.

As indicated earlier, RCMs have to meet the same basic requirements as CCMs (see "Who Is Eligible to Apply to the Global Fund" in Chapter 2: General Information).

Proposals from RCMs are also required to demonstrate they will be able to achieve outcomes that would not be possible with only national approaches. Furthermore, the proposals must demonstrate how the planned activities complement the national plans of each country involved; and how the activities are coordinated with the planned activities of the respective national CCMs.

Proposals from RCMs must also show that they are based on a natural collection of countries. Finally, proposals from RCMs must be endorsed by the CCMs in each country included in the proposal (except where a country included in a proposal is a Small Island Developing State).

ROs

ROs (including intergovernmental organisations, international NGOs and international FBOs who work across countries on a regional basis) may submit a coordinated proposal to address cross-border or regional issues. ROs have to be able to demonstrate that in their existing operations, they give effect to the principles of inclusiveness, multi-sector consultation and partnership which constitute core values of the Global Fund.

As was the case with RCMs, proposals from ROs:

- must demonstrate added value beyond that which could be achieved in individual countries;

- must demonstrate involvement of authorities in each of the countries involved; and

- must be endorsed by the CCMs in each of the countries involved.

Experience of the Early Rounds of Funding

In the last eight rounds of funding, 17 regional proposals were approved for funding, nine from Regional Organisations and eight from RCMs. Of the 17 proposals, eight covered regions made up of Small Island Developing States; the other nine focused on cross-border issues in countries sharing common borders. See Table 2.2 for a list of the proposals.

Of the proposals listed in Table 2.2: (a) the ones in Africa, Asia and Central and South America had CCMs in the countries involved; (b) the ones in the Caribbean had CCMs only in some countries; and (c) the ones in the Pacific Islands region had no CCMs.

Table 2.2 – Regional Proposals Funded in Rounds 2-9

Applicant	Title	Countries Involved
Caribbean Regional Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS (CRN+)	Strengthening the community of PLWHA and those affected by HIV/AIDS in the Caribbean – a community-based initiative	Antigua and Barbuda; Dominican Republic; Grenada; Guyana; Haiti; Jamaica; St. Kitts and Nevis; St. Lucia; Suriname; Trinidad and Tobago; St. Vincent and the Grenadines
RCM	Mesoamerican Project in integral care for mobile populations: reducing vulnerability of mobile populations in Central America to HIV/AIDS	Costa Rica; Guatemala; Honduras; Nicaragua; Panama; El Salvador
CARICOM	Scaling up the regional response to HIV/AIDS through the Pan Caribbean Partnership Against HIV/AIDS	16 Caribbean nations
Organismo Andino de Salud	Malaria control in the cross-border regions of the Andean: a community-based approach	Columbia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela
RCM	Scaling up prevention, care and treatment to combat the HIV/AIDS pandemic in the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) Sub-Region	Nine Eastern Caribbean nations
Regional Malaria Commission	Malaria Control in the Lubombo Spatial Development Initiative Area	South Africa, Mozambique, Swaziland
RCM	Pacific Islands Regional Coordinated Country Project on HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria (PIRCCP)	Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kribati, Niue, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu
RCM	Regional Proposal for the Expansion of Malaria Control to Gaza Province as Part of the	Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland

Applicant	Title	Countries Involved
	Lubombo Spatial Development Initiative	
RCM	Multi-Country Response to Malaria in the Pacific	Solomon Islands, Vanuatu
Organisation du Corridor Abidjan – Lagos (OCAL)	Consolidation and extension of the common regional project to tackle STI/HIV/AIDS along the Abidjan-Lagos corridor of migration.	Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Togo, Benin, Nigeria
RCM	Expanding universal access to HIV treatment, and targeting extreme STI prevalence – a major cause of HIV vulnerability in the Pacific Islands	Cook Islands, Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Nieu, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu
RCM	Improving Equitable Access To Quality DOTS Services For the Urban Poor, Marginalized Outer Island Populations and Other Identified Vulnerable Groups In the Pacific Islands	Cook Islands, Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Nieu, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu
Central American Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS (REDCA+)	Developing and strengthening the technical and professional skills of PLWHAs, to effectively address HIV-AIDS, in terms of the quality of life and the reduction of poverty amongst PLWHAs in Central America	El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama
COPRECOS-LAC	Increasing Evidence Based HIV Prevention Strategies Including Reducing Stigma, Discrimination and Gender Inequity within Uniformed Services.	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela
NAZ Foundation Int.	Reducing the impact of HIV on men who have sex with men and transgender populations in South Asia	Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka
RCM (PANCAP-CARICOM)	Fighting HIV in the Caribbean: A Strategic Regional Approach	18 Caribbean nations
SADC	HIV Cross-Border Initiative	Angola, Botswana, Congo (Democratic Republic), Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland , United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Strengths and Weaknesses of Past Regional Proposals

An analysis of regional proposals submitted in Rounds 3-9 that were approved for funding reveals that the TRP found that all of them represented significant added value. The following are extracts from the TRP comments on this point:

- The rationale for a regional approach is well articulated and based on a gap analysis of the regional strategy implementation plan.

- Provides real regional value (as it would be difficult and expensive to conduct separate programmes to improve the skills of PLWHA activists in the 11 countries).

- Clear added value of a multi-country proposal, because it may homogenize activities and policies.

- This proposal describes activities that have a clear added value on a regional basis, given the small size of a number of these island states.

- There is strategic justification for the regional approach.

- The applicant makes a clear commitment not to replace, or compete with, national strategies, but rather to complement national responses.

- The regional approach can create a forum and network for exchange of experience and capacity.

- The proposal presents a very good regional strategy for strengthening the capacity of community-based organisations to advocate for the improvement of the policy environment with regards men who have sex with men, transgender and HIV related issues – with a set of appropriate regional activities, followed up with context-based national activities.

- The regional approach is convincing with a history of formal and organised cooperation in a wide range of political, economic, and social areas.

Other strengths identified by the TRP for the approved regional programmes included the following:

- Proposed activities are well supported by the authorities in the five countries.

- Proposal is built around an established regional network that has a track record of support from several partners to undertake related initiatives.

- Good integration with national HIV/AIDS programs in each of the countries.

- Good representation of the countries involved in the programme's Steering Committee and the Inter-Country Consultative Committee.

- Proposal was developed through an inclusive, consultative process that involved national agencies.

- Multi-sectoral programme focused on high-risk or difficult-to-reach mobile populations; builds on previous experiences with mobile populations.

- Builds upon experience to date of the Round 2 Global Fund regional initiative and the effective institutional relationships that have developed.

- Proven involvement and commitment of all countries; backed by bi-national agreements and Memorandum of Understanding signed by Ministers of Health.

- Good regional rationale for training centres, and lab infrastructure and support.

- The border areas that this proposal addresses are under-served by central governments, and armed conflict contributes to poverty and disruption.

- Programme will use existing regional and national institutions.
- Governments will assume full responsibility by the end of Year 5.

With respect to the regional proposals that were rejected by the Global Fund, the most common weakness identified by the TRP in Rounds 3-7 was that the proposal added no value to what could be achieved by national CCMs working independently. Often, the TRP found that the proposals duplicated work that was being done nationally or overlapped with such work. Also, the TRP was critical of proposals where participating countries appeared to be grouped together because they meet the eligibility requirements of the Global Fund, rather than because of a common epidemiological situation or regionally-based need. The TRP said that this weakened the rationale for the proposal. Weaknesses that were identified less frequently included the following:

- Too ambitious for a regional collaborative network.
- Failed to show CCM endorsement or participation.
- Other partner participation not demonstrated.

In Round 6, the TRP was critical of regional proposals whose sponsors failed to consult CCMs (where such CCMs existed) before developing the proposals. The TRP observed that these proposals tended to be developed by external organisations, often outside of the framework of the needs and priorities of recipient countries, and then presented to the relevant CCMs for endorsement. The TRP suggested that a better approach would be for ROs and RCMs to work much more closely with CCMs, and to involve them in all stages of the development of the proposal. Therefore, if you are planning to submit a regional proposal, you will need to build in time to work with the CCMs. You will also need to build in time to obtain formal approval from the CCMs.

In Round 9, the TRP questioned the relevance of including service delivery interventions in regional proposals because, in some instances at least, this may contribute to the creation of parallel structures in-country.

The Bottom Line

Past experience shows that the bar is high when it comes to regional proposals. To have a chance of being funded, regional proposals:

- must demonstrate significant added value;
- should demonstrate (whenever possible) that the governments of all of the countries involved are supportive of the proposal;
- should demonstrate that the CCMs of the countries involved were consulted during the development of the proposal; and
- should contain letters of support from as many partners and key stakeholders as possible.

We also suggest that regional proposals be kept simple because it is usually harder to do work at a regional level than at a national level.

Composition of the RCM

The Global Fund has issued only minimal guidance concerning the composition of RCMs; there was nothing on this topic in the R9 Guidelines for Proposals. In the past, the Global Fund has said that it expects that the membership of the RCM will be drawn from a broad

range of sources, such as the membership of CCMs in the region, and other stakeholders and sectors. The Global Fund has recommended that RCMs covering a number of Small Island Development States include at least one government representative and one civil society representative from each state covered.

We suggest that if there are few or no CCMs in the area covered by the RCM, the composition of the RCM should be similar to the composition of CCMs. Please consult Aidspan's CCM Guide[7] for guidance on the composition of CCMs.

If there are CCMs in the area covered by the RCM, then a small RCM will probably suffice. It may be sufficient for the RCM to be composed solely of one person from each of the CCMs. This person could be the chair of the CCM, but it could also be someone else. Whoever represents the CCM on the RCM has to keep in mind the interests and concerns of all constituencies on the CCM, not just his or her own. However, we think that the RCM would be strengthened by the addition of representatives of a few large regional organisations. These representatives could speak for the non-government sector; this would be particularly helpful where all or a majority of the representatives from the CCMs are from the government sector. Alternatively, one or two civil society representatives from the CCMs could be added to the RCM to represent that sector.

Deciding Whether to Submit a Sub-CCM Proposal

For large countries, it may make sense for Sub-CCMs to be established and for the Sub-CCMs to submit proposals directly to the Global Fund.

In Section 2.3.1 of the R9 Guidelines for Proposals, the Global Fund says that Sub-CCMs can be formed by a state, province or similar administrative divisions, or by a group of the states, provinces or divisions acting together.

In Round 9, proposals were submitted from two Sub-CCMs, one from the North-West Region of the Russian Federation, and one from the Southern Sector of Sudan. A proposal from a Sub-CCMs must explain why it is being submitted through a Sub-CCM rather than the CCM itself; and must either be endorsed by the CCM or must provide evidence demonstrating the independent authority of the Sub-CCM.

If you go this route, you should make sure that the relationship between the Sub-CCM and the CCM is very clearly defined.

Guidance Concerning the Technical Content of Proposals

The Global Fund does not provide guidance on the technical content of proposals. Nor does Aidspan attempt do so in this guide. General guidance on HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria is provided by UNAIDS, the Stop TB Partnership and Roll Back Malaria, respectively.[8]

The Global Fund's FAQs on the Round 9 applications process stated that the local offices of UNAIDS, WHO and the following organisations may be able to provide technical or management assistance to complete the proposals process: UNICEF, United Nations

---

[7] The full title is *"The Aidspan Guide to Building and Running an Effective Country Coordinating Mechanism (CCM)."* The guide is available via www.aidspan.org/guides.

[8] UNAIDS is an agency of the U.N.: www.unaids.org; the STOP TB Partnership is a coalition of several organisations, including WHO, and a number of foundations and NGOs: www.stoptb.org/; the Roll Back Malaria Partnership is a coalition of several organisations, including a number of U.N. agencies, development partners and NGOs: www.rollbackmalaria.org.

Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), World Bank, European Union (EU), the [U.K.] Department for International Development (DFID), and other international or donor partners represented in the relevant country.[9]

This section of the guide provides a list of other resources and sources of information that applicants can access to assist them in developing the technical content of their proposals. The list is divided into five main topic areas:

1. HIV-specific
2. TB-specific
3. Malaria-specific
4. Health systems strengthening (HSS)
5. Other general or cross-cutting topics

Please Note: (a) This is not a comprehensive list. (b) Inclusion on this list should not be interpreted as an endorsement from either Aidspan or the Global Fund. (c) Many of the websites listed contain information on additional resources not listed here.

In addition, this section provides a list of UNAIDS' Technical Support Facilities.

HIV-Specific Resources and Sources

General

The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), is the main advocate for accelerated, comprehensive and coordinated global action on the epidemic, and is a focal point for HIV within the UN system. There is a wealth of information on HIV on the UNAIDS website at www.unaids.org. The following publications are of particular interest:

- *Towards Universal Access: Scaling Up Priority HIV/AIDS Interventions in the Health Sector*
  http://data.unaids.org/pub/Report/2009/20090930_tuapr_2009_en.pdf

- *Joint action for Results: UNAIDS Outcome Framework, 2009-2011*
  http://data.unaids.org/pub/Report/2010/jc1713_joint_action_en.pdf

The following publications from other organisations are also of interest:

- *Priority Interventions: HIV/AIDS Prevention, Treatment and Care in the Health Sector*
  www.who.int/hiv/pub/priorityinterventions

- *Community Based HIV Testing and HIV Treatment as Prevention: Good Practice Update June 2009*, International HIV/AIDS Alliance
  www.aidsalliance.org/publicationsdetails.aspx?id=385

Specific topics

Antiretroviral therapy

- World Health Organization (WHO)
  www.who.int/hiv/topics/treatment

---

[9] The Global Fund said that in limited situations some of these partners may also be able to provide financial assistance to help applicants complete their proposals, including assistance to help CCMs, Sub-CCM and RCMs document compliance with the critical six minimum eligibility requirements for coordinating mechanisms.

Children and HIV

- UNICEF's Unite for Children campaign
  www.uniteforchildren.org

- *The Aidspan Guide to Developing Global Fund Proposals to Benefit Children Affected by HIV/AIDS*
  www.aidspan.org/guides

- Campaign to End Pediatric HIV/AIDS, Global AIDS Alliance
  www.globalaidsalliance.org

- *Pediatric Treatment and Prevention Toolkit*, Global AIDS Alliance (prepared for Round 6)
  www.globalaidsalliance.org/index.php/618/

- WHO
  www.who.int/hiv/topics/paediatric

- *Support for Orphans and Other Vulnerable Children: Resource Pack*, International HIV/AIDS Alliance
  www.aidsalliance.org/publicationsdetails.aspx?id=439

- *Standard Package of Activities*: Orphans and Vulnerable Children, International HIV/AIDS Alliance, 2008
  www.aidsalliance.org/publicationsdetails.aspx?id=365

Gender

- *Agenda for Accelerated Country Action for Women, Girls, Gender Equality and HIV*
  http://data.unaids.org/pub/Agenda/2010/20100226_jc1794_agenda_for_accelerated_country_action_en.pdf

HIV prevention

- *HIV Prevention Toolkit*, UNAIDS
  http://hivpreventiontoolkit.unaids.org

- UNAIDS
  www.unaids.org/en/PolicyAndPractice/Prevention/default.asp

HIV testing and counselling

- WHO
  www.who.int/hiv/topics/vct

- *Guidance on Provider-Initiated HIV Testing and Counselling in Health Facilities*, WHO and UNAIDS
  www.unaids.org/en/KnowledgeCentre/Resources/PolicyGuidance/OperationGuidelines/20070517_policies_testing_keyoperationalguidelines.asp

- *Integrating HIV Voluntary Counselling and Testing Services into Reproductive Health Settings: Stepwise Guidelines for Programme Planners, Managers and Service Providers,* United Nations Population Fund and International Planned Parenthood Federation
  www.unaids.org/en/KnowledgeCentre/Resources/PolicyGuidance/OperationGuidelines/20070517_policies_testing_keyoperationalguidelines.asp

- *HIV Testing and Counselling: Addressing the Barriers to Scaling Up*, International HIV/AIDS Alliance, 2007
  www.aidsalliance.org/publicationsdetails.aspx?id=348

HIV/AIDS in prisons

- WHO
  www.who.int/hiv/topics/idu/prisons/en/index.html

- *Prison Needle Exchange: Lessons Learned from a Comprehensive Review of International Evidence and Experience*, Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network
  www.aidslaw.ca/publications/publicationsdocEN.php?ref=184

Human rights

- *International Guidelines on HIV/AIDS and Human Rights,* UNAIDS,
  www.unaids.org/en/KnowledgeCentre/Resources/PolicyGuidance/Techpolicies/HIVtesting_UNAIDS_policies.asp

Injecting drug use

- WHO
  www.who.int/hiv/topics/idu

- *Legislating for Health and Human Rights: Model Law on Drug Use and HIV/AIDS*, Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network
  www.aidslaw.ca/publications/publicationsdocEN.php?ref=620

- *Nothing About Us Without Us – Greater Meaningful Involvement of People Who Use Illegal Drugs: A Public Health, Ethical and Human Rights Imperative,* Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, International HIV/AIDS Alliance, Open Society Institute and International Network of People Who Use Drugs
  www.aidslaw.ca/publications/publicationsdocEN.php?ref=845

- *Standard Package of Activities: Drug Users*, International HIV/AIDS Alliance, 2008
  www.aidsalliance.org/publicationsdetails.aspx?id=362

Male circumcision for HIV prevention

- WHO
  www.who.int/hiv/topics/malecircumcision

Men who have sex with men

- *Standard Packages of Activities: Men Who Have Sex with Men*, International HIV/AIDS Alliance, 2008
  www.aidsalliance.org/publicationsdetails.aspx?id=364

PMTCT

- WHO
  www.who.int/hiv/topics/mtct

Sexual and reproductive health and HIV/AIDS

- *A Practical Toolkit for Writing Proposals to the Global Fund that Integrate Sexual and Reproductive Health and HIV/AIDS,* Global AIDS Alliance
  www.globalaidsalliance.org/page/-/PDFs/SRH_Toolkit_final.pdf

- WHO
  www.who.int/reproductivehealth/topics/linkages

- *Mobilising for RH HIV Integration*, Interact Worldwide
  www.interactworldwide.org/integrationinitiative.asp

- *Linking Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights with the HIV Response*, International HIV/AIDS Alliance, 2008
  www.aidsalliance.org/publicationsdetails.aspx?id=333

Sex work

- WHO
  www.who.int/hiv/topics/sex_work

- *Sex Work, Violence and HIV: A Guide for Programmes with Sex Workers*, International HIV/AIDS Alliance, 2008
  www.aidsalliance.org/publicationsdetails.aspx?id=308

TB and HIV

- WHO
  www.who.int/hiv/topics/tb

Women and HIV

- *Respect, Protect and Fulfill: Legislating for Women's Rights in the Context of HIV/AIDS*, Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network
  www.aidslaw.ca/publications/publicationsdocEN.php?ref=972

TB-Specific Resources and Sources

General

The goal of the Stop TB Partnership, a global, multi-sectoral initiative involving over 1,000 partner organisations, is to eliminate TB as a public health problem. Information is available on the Stop TB website at www.stoptb.org. Stop TB has released a strategy on tuberculosis control. *The Global Plan to Stop TB 2006-2015* is available at www.stoptb.org/globalplan. Guidance and tools for preparing TB proposals for the Global Fund are available at www.who.int/tb/dots/planningframeworks/en/.

Specific topics

Stigma

- *Understanding and Challenging TB Stigma: Toolkit for Action*, International HIV/AIDS Alliance, 2009
  www.aidsalliance.org/publicationsdetails.aspx?id=343

TB and HIV

- WHO
  www.who.int/hiv/topics/tb

Treatment

- *Treatment of Tuberculosis: Guidelines*, WHO
  http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2010/9789241547833_eng.pdf

Malaria-Specific Resources and Sources

General

The Roll Back Malaria (RBM) Partnership is the global framework to implement coordinated action against malaria. Information is available on the RBM at www.rollbackmalaria.org. RBM has prepared a *Global Strategic Plan 2005-2015*, available at www.rollbackmalaria.org/forumV/docs/gsp_en.pdf, and a *Global Malaria Action Plan*, available at www.rollbackmalaria.org/gmap/index.

Specific topics

Malaria and Pregnancy

- *Malaria In Pregnancy (MIP) Toolkit*, Roll Back Malaria Partnership
  www.rollbackmalaria.org/mechanisms/mpwg

- *Integrated Management of Pregnancy and Childbirth (IMPAC) Guide*, WHO
  www.rollbackmalaria.org/partnership/wg/wg_pregnancy/docs/pcpnc.pdf

Procurement of bed nets

- *Ten Quick Facts on Procuring LLINs,* Global Fund
  www.theglobalfund.org/pdf/round6/Pol_R6_10QuickFactsLLINs_Jun06.pdf

- *Procurement and Supply Management Toolkit,* World Bank Malaria Control Booster Program
  http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPROCUREMENT/Resources/Malaria-Toolkit.pdf

Health Systems Strengthening (HSS) Resources and Sources

Before Round 7, the Global Health Workforce Alliance (www.healthworkforce.info/advocacy), a global partnership launched in May 2006 by the WHO to address the worldwide shortage of health care workers, issued a call to action to encourage applicants to include health systems strengthening activities in their Global Fund proposals. In its call, the Alliance said that the Global Fund "can be used to support critical health workforce investments that are needed to advance efforts to combat [the three] diseases, including by funding a portion of a national health workforce strategy." The Alliance added that:

> For example, in 2005, Malawi used the Fund to support part of its Emergency Human Resource Programme, including expanding health professional pre-service training capacity and recruiting, training, and paying the salaries … of hundreds of nurses, doctors, clinical officers, and counselors, and even more community-based health workers. Other innovative uses of the Fund for health system strengthening have included support for a community health insurance scheme and electrifying and rehabilitating health facilities. Where the requisite link can be made to the fight against the Fund's target diseases, the Fund can also assist countries in their overall health workforce and health sector planning processes.

Other sources of information on HSS:

- World Health Organisation (WHO)

  - WHO Health Systems Strategy
    www.who.int/healthsystems/strategy/en/

  - Global Fund proposal guidance for Round 9
    www.who.int/healthsystems/gf_round9/en/index

- Health systems strengthening
  www.who.int/healthsystems/en/

- Planning human resources
  www.who.int/healthsystems/gf_hrh_guidelines08.pdf

- *The World Health Report 2008: Primary Health Care (Now More Than Ever)*
  www.who.int/whr/2008/en

- *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation of Human Resources for Health*, WHO, 2009
  www.who.int/hrh/resources/handbook/en/index.html

- *HIV and Health Systems Strengthening: Policy Position Paper,* International HIV/AIDS Alliance
  www.aidsalliance.org/publicationsdetails.aspx?id=354

- Information prepared by Physicians for Human Rights
  http://physiciansforhumanrights.org/library/report-2007-02-27.html

- Information prepared by Asia Pacific Action Alliance on Human Resources for Health (AAAH)
  http://www.aaahrh.org

General or Cross-Cutting Topics – Resources and Sources

Community systems strengthening

- *A Framework for Analysing and Organising Data Regarding Community System Strengthening in Round 8*, International HIV/AIDS Alliance
  www.aidsalliance.org/publicationsdetails.aspx?id=334

Sexual and reproductive health

- Interact Worldwide
  www.interactworldwide.org,
- International HIV/AIDS Alliance
  http://www.aidsalliance.org/TechnicalThemeDetails.aspx?Id=10
- International Planned Parenthood Foundation
  www.ippf.org
- Population Action International
  www.populationaction.org
- WHO
  www.who.int/topics/reproductive_health/en/
- UNAIDS
  www.unaids.org/en/PolicyAndPractice/SexualAndReproductiveHealth/default.asp
- UNFPA
  www.unfpa.org/rh/index.htm

Interaction between HIV and Malaria

- WHO, including the Global Malaria Programme
  www.who.int
- Roll Back Malaria Partnership
  www.rollbackmalaria.org.
- Kaisernetwork.org
  www.kaisernetwork.org/daily_reports/rep_index.cfm?hint=4&DR_ID=41551

M&E and health information systems

- *Health Metric Networks Assessment Tool*
  www.who.int/healthmetrics/tools/en

Operations and implementation research

- *Stop TB Planning Matrix and Framework Tool*
  www.who.int/tb/dots/planningframeworks/en/index.html
- Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases (TDR)
  http://apps.who.int/tdr/
- *Operational Research in Support of Antiretroviral Therapy Scale-Up*
  http://apps.who.int/tdr/
- *M&E Toolkit*
  www.theglobalfund.org/en/me/guidelines_tools/?lang=en
- Measure Evaluation
  www.cpc.unc.edu/measure

UNAIDS Technical Support Facilities

The UNAIDS Technical Support Facilities (TSFs) consist of small management teams hosted by existing regional institutions, and are designed to facilitate country partners access to technical support. While the main purpose of the TSFs is to build national and regional capacity to affectively respond to AIDS, they also conduct specific capacity building programmes for consultants and country partners.

Contact information:

International Centre for Technical Cooperation on HIV/AIDS, Brazil
cict@aids.gov.br / www.cict-aids.org

TSF Eastern Africa (Nairobi)
tsfeasternafrica@amrefhq.org / www.tsfeasternafrica.org

TSF Southern Africa (Johannesburg)
info@tsfsouthernafrica.com / www.tsfsouthernafrica.com

TSF South East Asia & Pacific (Kuala Lumpur)
info@tsfseap.org / www.tsfseap.org

TSF South Asia
info@tsfsouthasia.org / http://tsfsouthasia.org

TSF West and Central Africa (Ouagadougou)
tsfwca@tsfwca.org / www.tsfwca.org

Coordination of AIDS Technical Support (CoATS)

CoATS in a UNAIDS-run shared database on HIV-related technical support, providing information on providers, funders and recipients. To access the database, contact CoATS@unaids.org.

Implications of the Move Towards a Single Stream of Funding

The Global Fund Board has approved a new funding architecture, the central core of which is the concept of a single stream of funding per disease per PR. Under this concept, where there currently are multiple grants for the same PR for the same disease, the grants will be consolidated into a single grant. And, in future, if additional funding is approved for that PR and disease, that funding will be rolled into the same grant.

The transition to the single stream of funding will occur gradually over the next 18 months. During that time, there will be opportunities for countries to consolidate several grants into one. These opportunities include when grant agreements or amended grant agreements are signed. They also include when new proposals are submitted for funding. For Round 10, consolidation will be *optional*, but it will be *mandatory* for Round 11.

If an applicant wishes to consolidate grants when it submits a Round 10 proposal, then the applicant would submit a "consolidated proposal." The consolidated proposal would contain a funding request for "new money" to implement new programmes, but the proposal budget would also include unspent moneys from existing grants (for the same disease and PR).

Exactly how this will be done in Round 10 is not yet known. It is possible that applicants submitting a consolidated proposal will need to use a different proposal form than that used by applicants submitting a "regular" proposal. Information about how this will work could be issued by the Global Fund at any time, but it may not come until Round 10 is officially launched.

It is important to remember that consolidation is *optional* for Round 10.

Expected Changes for Round 10

There will not likely be a large number of substantive changes to the Round 10 proposal form and Guidelines for Proposal. However, there may be quite a few cosmetic changes as the Global Fund Secretariat tries to simply its questions and its guidance.

Applicants should expect to see some substantive changes related to policies adopted by the Global Fund Board since Round 9 was launched. Policies have been adopted on the following topics: Gender equality; sexual orientation and gender identity; the Global Fund's response to HIV/AIDS; PMTCT; and community systems strengthening.

Gender equality

Relevant documents:
Gender Equality Strategy
www.theglobalfund.org/documents/strategy/TheGenderEqualityStrategy_en.pdf
Gender Equality Strategy Plan of Action 2009-2012
(not available online as we went to press)

The *Gender Equality Strategy*, adopted in November 2008, says that the Global Fund will champion and fund proposals that scale up services and interventions that reduce gender-related risks and vulnerabilities to infection; decrease the burden of disease for those most at-risk; mitigate the impact of the three diseases, and address structural inequalities and discrimination. The *Gender Equality Strategy* also says that:

- The Guidelines for Proposals will require that applicants include a gender analysis in their proposals, based on age and sex disaggregated data.

- One of the three key criteria that the TRP uses to evaluate proposals is "soundness of approach." The TRP will treat this criterion as requiring evidence of a thorough gender analysis.

- In addition to providing a gender analysis, applicants will be required to explain how vulnerable groups will be reached and how interventions will have a sustained impact on women and girls.

- The Global Fund will require that in their M&E systems countries make available data disaggregated by sex and age. Countries that do not already collect this data will be asked to include in their proposals requests for funding to be able to do so.

The *Plan of Action* document says that the gender-related components of the proposal form and Guidelines for Proposals will be strengthened to encourage countries to submit proposals based on a disease strategy that is informed by gender analysis, including epidemiological data disaggregated by gender and age.

Thus, applicants should expect to see additional requirements on the Round 10 proposal form with respect to gender equality.

Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

Relevant document:
The Global Fund Strategy in Relation to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identities
www.theglobalfund.org/documents/replenishment/2010/The%20Global%20FUND%20SOGI%20Sttrategy%20Update.pdf

The Global Fund's sexual orientation and gender identities (SOGI) strategy seeks to create an environment that is supportive of strengthened programming targeting sex workers, men who have sex with men, transgender people and other sexual minorities.

An action plan for 2009-2012 to support the strategy's implementation includes sections dedicated to, among other things, strengthening country coordinating mechanisms; strengthening the proposal and application process; strengthening the expertise and capacity of the Technical Review Panel; and ensuring that monitoring, evaluation and reporting is positively oriented toward work addressing sexual orientation and gender identities.

The SOGI strategy says that proposal forms and Guidelines for Proposal have been strengthened in order to ensure that the needs of sex workers, men who have sex with men, transgender people and other sexual minorities are adequately taken into account.

The Global Fund's Response to HIV/AIDS

Relevant policy:
Enhancing the Global Fund's Response to HIV/AIDS
www.theglobalfund.org/en/board/meetings/nineteenth/ (see "Board decisions" and look for Decision Point GF/B19/DP34)

In 2009, the Global Fund Board adopted a policy statement on enhancing the response to HIV/AIDS which, among other things, directed the Global Fund Secretariat "to urgently work with partners to adopt measures to identify gaps and to further improve the quality of Global Fund supported prevention, treatment, care and support, including operational research to identify effective scaling up strategies to improve outcomes." The policy statement also said that these measures should be included in the review of the Round 10 proposal form and guidelines.

PMTCT

Relevant policy:
Enhancing the Global Fund's Response to HIV/AIDS
www.theglobalfund.org/en/board/meetings/nineteenth/ (see "Board decisions" and look for Decision Point GF/B19/DP34)

In its policy statement on enhancing the response to HIV/AIDS, the Global Fund Board said that scaling-up access to, and use of, effective prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT) is crucial to attaining universal access and is a critical component of the Global Fund's Gender Equality Strategy. The Board directed the Global Fund Secretariat to conduct a review of the portfolio to identify paediatric HIV high burden countries with low PMTCT and pediatric HIV care, support, and treatment coverage rates and to use available mechanisms to accelerate transitions to more efficacious ARV regimens for effective PMTCT strategies.

As a result, the Secretariat is working with 20 countries in sub-Saharan Africa to assess the possibility of reprogramming existing Global Fund grants to allow for a switch from the use of single dose nevirapine to more effective dual or triple ARV therapy for the prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT). Applicants should expect to see something on the Round 10 proposal form about ensuring that PMTCT programmes are using dual or triple HIV therapy.

Community Systems Strengthening

Since Round 8, the Global Fund has been encouraging applicants to include initiatives on community systems strengthening (CSS) in their proposals. In the interim, considerable time and effort (particularly in the past several months) has been invested in defining exactly what should be included in a "CSS framework." It is possible that some of the outcomes of this work will find their way onto the Round 10 proposal form.

Other Relevant Documents and Links

There are a number of other documents that the Global Fund recommends applicants become familiar with before they complete their proposals. A full list of these documents will not be available until the Global Fund issues its call for proposals for Round 10. In this section, we have listed many of the documents that the Global Fund recommended be reviewed by applicants at the time of Round 9. These documents are available via www.theglobalfund.org/en/rounds/9/. That web page contains a list of categories; clicking on a category takes you to another page where the documents can be located. Because it is not always obvious which documents are available in each category, we have organised the information by category and we have provided the website address for each category. Additional documents, not listed here, are also available via these web pages. Of all the documents listed in this section, only the Round 9 FAQs and Fact Sheets are likely to change for Round 10.

Round 9 FAQ and Fact Sheets
www.theglobalfund.org/en/rounds/9/faq/

Round 9 – Frequently Asked Questions
Available in all six UN languages.

Grant Consolidation Frequently Asked Questions
Available in all six UN languages.

Fact Sheet: Community Systems Strengthening
Fact Sheet: Dual-Track Financing
Fact Sheet: Ensuring a Gender Sensitive Approach
Fact Sheet: Grant Consolidation
Fact Sheet: TB/HIV
Fact Sheet: The Global Fund's Approach to Health Systems Strengthening
Fact Sheet: Sexual Minorities in the Context of the HIV Epidemic

Most of these are available in all six UN languages.

CCM, Sub-CCM and RCM Guidelines and Requirements
www.theglobalfund.org/en/ccm/guidelines/

Guidelines and Requirement for Country Coordinating Mechanisms
Also known under the short title "CCM Guidelines."
Available in all six UN languages.

Clarifications on CCM Minimum Requirements
Available in all six UN languages.

Monitoring and Evaluation
www.theglobalfund.org/en/me/guidelines_tools/?lang=en

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Toolkit – 2009 Version
Provides the "essentials" of agreed-upon best practice in M&E.
Available in English and Portuguese.

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Guideline
Guidance concerning what needs to be in the M&E Plan submitted by applicants.
Available in English, French, Spanish and Russian.

Performance Framework Template
A Performance Framework must be submitted with each proposal.
Available in English, French and Spanish.

Monitoring and Performance Manual
Provides a comprehensive set of guidelines on monitoring and evaluation standards and practices throughout the lifecycle of Global Fund grants.
Available in English.

Monitoring and Evaluation Self-Assessment
A tool to enable organisations to evaluate their M&E plans and systems.
Available as a PDF file in English and French. Available in Excel format in English, French and Spanish See the website above for an explanation of when to use the different formats.

Procurement and Supply Management
www.theglobalfund.org/en/procurement/

Guide to the Global Fund's Policies on Procurement and Supply Management
Available in English.

PSM Plan Template
Available in English, French, Spanish and Russian.

Technical Assistance and Other Guidance
http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/rounds/9/other/

Making Co-Investment a Reality
Guide on Co-Investment, written by the GBC and the GTZ, and presenting the co-investment approach as well as case studies.
Available in English and French.

Technical Review Panel
www.theglobalfund.org/en/trp/reports/?lang=en

The Report of the TRP and the Secretariat on Round 9 Proposals
Available in English, Spanish, Russian, Chinese and Arabic.

Appeal Process
www.theglobalfund.org/en/trp/appeals/

Rules Governing the Global Fund's Appeal Mechanism for Applications Not Approved for Funding
Contains information on eligibility, on the grounds for appeal of Global Fund Board decisions on proposals, and on the applicable conditions and procedures.
Available in all six UN languages.

Rounds-Based Channel Appeal Forms
Available in English, French, Spanish and Russian.

Grant Negotiation and Management Documents
www.theglobalfund.org/en/policies/

Fiduciary Arrangements for Grant Recipients
Describes the roles and responsibilities of different entities within the Global Fund's accountability arrangements and performance-based funding system.
Available in all six UN languages.

Guidelines for Annual Audits of Program Financial Statements
Provide operational details on the Global Fund's requirements for external annual audits of the expenditures of PRs and SRs.
Available in all six UN languages.

Guidelines for Performance Based Funding
Provide operational details for grant recipients on the Global Fund's system for performance based funding.
Available in all six UN languages.

Other documents not included at the websites listed above:

.
LFA Guidelines for the Principal Recipient Assessment
Available in English.
www.theglobalfund.org/en/lfa/documents/ (under "LFA Guidelines PR Assessment")

The Framework Document of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria
Sets out the basic principles under which the Global Fund operates.
Available in English.
www.theglobalfund.org/documents/TGF_Framework.pdf

The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness
An international agreement on increasing efforts in harmonisation, alignment and managing aid for results.
Available in English.
www.oecd.org/document/18/0,2340,en_2649_3236398_35401554_1_1_1_1,00.html

Health Metrics Network Assessment Tool
A WHO assessment tool for country health information systems.
Available in English.
www.who.int/healthmetrics/tools/hmn_assessment_tool_ver2.xls

Chapter 3: The Proposal Development Process

This chapter explains why it is important to establish a proposal development process, and why the CCM's proposal should be integrated with other national processes. The chapter lists a series of actions that the CCM can include in its proposal development process, and discusses issues that need to be considered for each action. The chapter then provides suggestions concerning how the CCM can manage the proposal development process. Finally, the chapter discusses several ways in which the CCM can coordinate the process of soliciting and reviewing in-country submissions for possible inclusion in the country coordinated proposal.

Special Note:

This chapter refers extensively to documents prepared by the Global Fund for the ninth round of funding, particularly the "Guidelines for Proposals: Round 9," but also the Round 9 proposal form. The Global Fund is not expected to release similar documents for Round 10 until it formally issues its call for proposals in May 2010. Because Aidspan wanted to release Volume 1 of this guide in advance of the formal call, we have had to rely on the Round 9 documents. However, with respect to the topics covered in this chapter, we do not expect that the Global Fund's Round 10 documents will differ significantly from its Round 9 documents.

The Importance of Establishing a Proposal Development Process

As we noted in the previous chapters, the development of proposals to the Global Fund is not just about filling in the proposal form. Considerable time and effort are required to ensure that proposals meet the Global Fund's requirements in terms of technical eligibility and in terms of the functioning of the coordinating mechanism.

The Global Fund wants to ensure that the proposal development process is transparent, that there is broad input into the development of proposals, and that proposals fit in with existing priorities. The following guidance regarding the proposal development process, taken from the R7 Guidelines for Proposals, remains relevant for Round 10:

Principle of broad dissemination of information relevant to proposal development: To seek as broad input as possible into any proposal submitted to the Global Fund, **Applicants** are required to disseminate widely all information related to the proposal process to **all** stakeholders actively involved in the diseases, including the broad range of non-government stakeholders and constituencies at the community level.

Information that is expected to be publicly shared before the proposal is developed includes: the timing relevant to the Global Fund's Round 7 call for proposals; **how** interested stakeholders may apply to the CCM/Sub-CCM or RCM for a smaller proposal to be included in the CCM/Sub-CCM or RCM's consolidated proposal to the Global Fund; **the criteria** upon which individual proposals will be evaluated by the CCM/Sub-CCM or RCM for possible inclusion in the consolidated proposal; **and other guidance** believed relevant (e.g., information on items such as national priorities for each of the three diseases, updated disease burden statistics, and perceived gaps in existing services being provided to most at risk groups).

The proposal development process should also allow all sectors and constituencies (both CCM/Sub-CCM and RCM members and non-members) enough time to provide input into the drafting of the proposal to be submitted to the Global Fund. CCMs, Sub-CCMs and RCM must

have in place a fair, transparent, documented process for reviewing all qualitatively sound submissions they receive for integration into the proposal prior to final submission.

The nomination of one or more PRs, and the selection of SRs, are also a part of the proposal development process. The Global Fund requires that the nominations and selections happen in a transparent manner and that the processes be documented. Although the Global Fund requirements regarding PR and SR selection are expressed in very similar terms, the requirements concerning PRs are stricter. In recent rounds of funding, applicants had to describe the PR selection process in the section of the application form dealing with the eligibility of the proposal; whereas the description of the process for SR selection was relegated to the section of the proposal form dealing with programme management.

In previous rounds, applicants were asked to describe on the proposal form how they complied with the Global Fund's requirements related to the proposal development process. We expect that the proposal form for Round 10 will also ask for this information.

A well-organised proposal development process can help to ensure that the eligibility criteria are met and that good quality proposals are developed on time. However, getting the process right is not just about obtaining a favourable decision from the Global Fund. It is about building the foundations for an initiative that will be implemented over several years and that will constitute a significant contribution to efforts to fight HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. These foundations include:

- achieving an appropriate focus for the proposal, one that responds to the country's needs and complements existing efforts;

- developing strategies that are consistent with good practice and with current capacity, but that can be quickly taken to scale;

- developing partnerships across sectors that will be central to the implementation of the initiative; and

- ensuring that all of the components of the project – the focus, the strategies, the workplan, the budget, procurement plans, management and implementation arrangements, M&E plans – are harmonised and consistent.

Integration with Other National Processes

The Global Fund is a major source of support to regional and national efforts to fight HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, and Global Fund grants can therefore have a major impact on how these efforts are planned and organised. Conscious of this, the Global Fund aims to fit in with existing coordination, planning and programming processes.

As noted in Chapter 1: Introduction and Background, the context into which Global Fund applications fit should look something like this:

1. A country determines its national *strategy* for tackling HIV/AIDS, TB, or malaria.

2. The country then designs one or more *programmes* designed to implement that strategy.

3. The country then submits *proposals* (to places such as the Global Fund) seeking financial support for one or more of those programmes.

Although the above activities refer to national strategies and country-based projects, they can also be applied to multi-country or regional-level initiatives.

According to this model, the Global Fund's calls for proposals represent opportunities to fund existing strategies, rather than being the impetus for strategy development. It is not always easy to make a distinction between these two, because Global Fund opportunities represent such a major contribution to programme funding and because members of the Global Fund coordinating mechanism are very often the same people as those responsible for developing overall strategies and plans (see box).

Providing that strategic plans have been developed through broad consultations undertaken under the leadership of the relevant authority, they should contain much of the information required to develop a sound funding proposal. However, there are some limitations to this "general rule":

> **Membership on CCMs vs integration with existing processes**
>
> Those responsible for overall strategy development – such as national AIDS councils – are often represented on CCMs. It is very important that a distinction be made between these functions. For instance, just because a national AIDS council executive is a member of the CCM, this does not mean that the work of the CCM is automatically "integrated" with the national strategic process. Effective integration requires a formal process whereby the roles of different entities are recognised and maintained.

- Strategy development tends to take place in cycles, with plans covering several years. Countries or regions that have recently developed strategies for HIV/AIDS, TB or malaria are obviously in a very good position to develop programmes and Global Fund proposals. On the other hand, countries or regions that are only two or three years away from the end of the current strategic plan for a given disease are on shakier ground.

- Strategic plans are unlikely to contain the most recent data on the "gaps" that the Global Fund will help to fill, for instance in terms of programme coverage or funding commitments from governments or donor institutions. In many cases, it will be possible to obtain recent data through established M&E frameworks and from the main providers of funding.

- The gap analysis should identify gaps that are anticipated in the future rather than focussing on current gaps, as the time-lag between the development of Global Fund proposals and the receipt of funding can be a year or more.

On the other hand, strategic plans that have *not* been developed through a broad consultative process are unlikely to provide an accurate picture of the programming gaps, and also run the risk of ignoring the priorities of marginalised groups.

Generally, even where there are recently developed strategies for tackling the diseases, they will need to be supplemented by up-to-date analyses of the current situation related to the issues listed above. These analyses need to be carried out under the leadership of the relevant authorities, although the coordinating mechanism should provide advice on the types of information required. The coordinating mechanism can also provide additional input as necessary. As well, there should be broad representation in the analysis, including having participation from marginalised groups.

Designing the Proposal Development Process

For the purposes of this section, the proposal development process is considered to have begun once the CCM has taken the decision to submit an application to the Global Fund for

a given round. It is assumed that the decision to apply has been taken on the basis of the broader strategic analyses and situation assessments described above.

Each proposal to the Global Fund is different, so CCMs need to design a process that fits with their specific requirements. The following is a list of actions that CCMs may want to include in their process:

- Analyse the strengths and weaknesses of previously submitted proposals.
- Define the overall project focus.
- Assign responsibilities for proposal development.
- Identify, assign and manage the resources needed for the proposal development process.
- Implement a process for soliciting and reviewing submissions for possible integration into the proposal.
- Draft the proposal components.
- Identify the PRs and SRs.
- Compile and submit the final proposal.
- Maintain regular communications.

Although there is some logic to the order in which the actions have been presented, this sequence is by no means the only way to organise the process. Indeed, some of the actions (like drafting the proposal components and maintaining regular communications) are likely to take place in a continuous way during the whole process.

CCMs need to decide which actions to include and in what order they should be done. CCMs should also ensure that their process meets all of the Global Fund requirements and is properly documented. Once the main actions have been decided on, the CCM should also develop a feasible timeline, ensuring that adequate time is left at the end of the process to secure the approval of all members of the CCM and to make any final changes.

In the next section, each action is presented and discussed in more detail.

Issues to Consider for Each Action in the Process

Note: For most of the actions discussed in this section, we have provided "key questions" that CCMs may wish to consider in deciding whether they wish to include the action and in planning how to carry it out. These questions are shown in shaded text.

Action: Analyse the Strengths and Weaknesses of Previously Submitted Proposals

CCMs should carefully analyse the feedback received from the TRP on proposals submitted in previous rounds, whatever the TRP's final recommendation was. Obviously, feedback on proposals that were approved for funding (i.e., Category 1 or 2) will highlight strengths that CCMs should try to replicate in their Round 10 proposals. Feedback on proposals that were rated Category 2 by the TRP contain requests for clarifications that provide valuable insights into what information the Global Fund expects to see included in proposals.

Analysing feedback from the TRP on previous proposals is perhaps most important for CCMs whose proposals were unsuccessful. When the TRP rates a proposal Category 3, it

usually means that the concept of the proposal is appropriate, but that the proposal itself is weak. CCMs that have had proposals classified Category 3 should consider resubmitting the proposal, taking care to strengthen it on the basis of the TRP feedback.

A very small number of proposals are rated Category 4 by the TRP. These are proposals that the TRP considers to be inappropriate in the context of the country or region, irrelevant to the Global Fund's objectives, or in need of complete redevelopment. CCMs that have had proposals classified into Category 4 need to start their entire proposal development process over again, taking care to avoid the problems faced in previous rounds.

Note: The Round 9 proposal form contained a specific section relating to proposals that were not approved in previous rounds and that are being resubmitted, asking applicants to explain the adjustments made in the new proposal to address the weaknesses identified by the TRP. We expect that the Round 10 proposal form will contain a similar provision.

Whatever disease components the CCM is planning to submit for Round 10, the CCM should review the strengths and weaknesses of *all* disease components it submitted in previous rounds, because some of the TRP's comments are general in nature. For instance, feedback on a Round 9 malaria proposal classified as Category 3 may still be useful to that CCM's HIV/AIDS proposal in Round 10, because it may be, for example, that the TRP was dissatisfied with the level of consultation or stakeholder input into the proposal or with the PR selection process.

Obviously, for an individual CCM, the most valuable information comes from the feedback provided by the TRP on previous proposals submitted by that CCM. However, lessons from other countries can also be helpful. The Aidspan report, *Key Strengths of Round 8 and 9 Proposals to the Global Fund* reviews the main strengths and weaknesses identified by the TRP across all proposals. The report is available at www.aidspan.org/aidspanpublications.

Key questions related to this action
⇒ Have you previously submitted proposals to the Global Fund?
⇒ Which parts of your previous proposals did the TRP consider strong, or weak?
⇒ How can you ensure that the strengths of previous proposals are also reflected in your new proposal? Has anything changed in the context that might jeopardise these strengths this time round?
⇒ Were the weaknesses related to the process by which the proposal was developed, to the technical content, or to the management arrangement? Which of these are relevant to which components of the new proposal? What do you need to change in order to resolve the weaknesses?

Action: Define the Overall Project Focus

As noted above it is assumed that broad strategic guidelines and an overall understanding of priorities and gaps at country or regional level already exist. This information can be used to establish the overall focus of the project that will be submitted to the Global Fund. Having an overall focus can help to shape the next steps of proposal development, in particular the solicitation of input into different components of the proposal. It can also help to ensure that the content of the proposal is well integrated with existing strategic priorities and that the proposal will not duplicate existing efforts.

Defining the overall focus is typically the role of the CCM. In fulfilling this role, the CCM must pay attention to the need for broad-based participation. In this regard, it may consider asking its members to conduct consultations with their respective sectors. An overall focus should be defined for each separate disease component that is to be included in the proposal. In addition, if more than one component is being applied for, this is an opportunity to establish what the overall focus should be for health systems strengthening efforts and other cross-cutting aspects. CCMs may also wish to establish some core principles that should characterise proposals – for instance, in relation to how the proposal will tackle stigma and discrimination, marginalisation and gender issues.

Some CCMs may prefer not to begin by defining an overall focus, but to work in a more "bottom-up" manner, defining the focus purely on the basis of the multiple inputs received from different stakeholders. Although this approach can work, it is likely to make it harder to describe the "big picture" of the project in terms of epidemiological priorities and funding gaps.

Key questions related to this action

⇒ Is the data required to carry out this action already available or easily obtainable from the relevant national or regional authorities, and from the relevant donor agencies? (See the section above entitled "Integration with other national and regional processes" for more information on the data required).

⇒ Were the national or regional strategies on which the project focus is based developed with sufficient stakeholder consultation? If not, how will the CCM remedy this?

⇒ Do the identified gaps match the objectives of the Global Fund?

⇒ Will the proposal attempt to address all of the identified gaps, or will it just focus on some? If so, on what basis will this focus be defined?

⇒ Is the intention to resubmit a previously unsuccessful proposal? If so, does the initial focus need to be revised?

⇒ What strategies will be employed to address "new" issues that the Global Fund is interested in promoting?

Action: Assign Responsibilities for Proposal Development

Global Fund proposal development is a lengthy and complex task, and care is needed to ensure that it is managed effectively. The CCM should try to decide on responsibilities for proposal development well in advance of the official call for proposals. This issue is discussed in more detail in the next section of this chapter ("Managing the Proposal Development Process").

Key questions related to this action

⇒ Are any CCM members prepared and available to take on an "executive" role in proposal development?

⇒ Which relevant proposal development skills exist among CCM members? More importantly, are any important skills missing?

⇒ Will external resource people or consultants be required to help the CCM during the process? How will they be identified? How will they be instructed and managed?

Action: Identify, Assign and Manage the Resources Needed for the Proposal Development Process

The process often requires a great deal of resources, both financial and material. These need to be paid for or contributed in kind. It is important that the required resources be identified and planned for up front, so that there are no administrative and financial bottlenecks during the process. Possible resources to plan for include the following:

- facilities for meetings
- transport and communication costs (especially when proposals cover large geographic areas or more than one country)
- computing facilities
- printing costs
- resource people (e.g., technical specialists, administrators, translators)

Key questions related to this action

⇒ What resources are required for the process?

⇒ Which of these resources can be contributed by CCM members or other interested parties?

⇒ Which need to be paid for? Where will the funding for this come from? Will the funding be managed centrally? If so, by whom?

⇒ Is there a risk that approval procedures for financial expenditure will cause delays to the process? How can this be minimised?

Action: Implement a Process for Soliciting and Reviewing Submissions for Possible Integration into the Proposal

Many CCMs assume that the Global Fund's requirement for an in-country submissions process requires an open call for submissions. CCMs struggle with this requirement because there is very little guidance on how the call should be organised, what kinds of eligibility criteria should apply (if any), and what framework should be provided to applicants.

Because this can be a lengthy process, we have devoted an entire section of the chapter to it (see "Process for Soliciting and Reviewing Submissions" below).

Action: Draft the Proposal Components

Different sections of the proposal should be drafted at different times and by different teams. It is even possible for the different sections to be approved and finalised at different times. For instance, those parts of the proposal dealing with eligibility and CCM functioning can be drafted early on, but other parts, such as those requiring documentation of the proposal development process, can only be drafted once the process is nearly complete. The parts of the proposal concerning the national programme context can be also drafted early in the process.

The most challenging and complex sections of the proposal are those that relate to the overall needs assessment and gap analysis, the component implementation strategies and the budgets, because these sections will essentially be a compilation of all of the different submissions that have been accepted for inclusion in the proposal.

The scale of this task depends to a large extent on the format in which the submissions have been received. If the submissions follow a project outline similar to that used in the Global Fund proposal form (i.e., with the same hierarchy of objectives, standardised activity types, indicators and budget headings), they will simply need to be assembled and summarised. However if submissions do not follow a standardised format, they will need to be rationalised into the same format before they can be assembled. This is likely to be a considerable task. The format for submissions is discussed further in the section "Process for Soliciting and Reviewing Submissions" below.

Volume 2 of this guide will include detailed guidance on filling in the Round 10 proposal form, and will highlight any major changes from, or additions to, the Round 9 form.

> **Key questions related to this action**
>
> ⇒ Which sections can be drafted early on? Would it be helpful to prepare drafts of the sections relating to national context and needs early on and distribute them to stakeholders as a basis for developing the proposal content?
>
> ⇒ Although it is usual to fill in the summary sections at the very end of the process, it may be useful to have short drafts of these sections that are regularly updated, in order to keep an eye on the overall "shape" of the proposal.
>
> ⇒ Do the people responsible for writing the proposal have a solid grasp of the project framework used by the Global Fund (i.e., objectives, targets and indicators, service delivery areas (SDAs), key expenditure Items)? Do those in the CCM responsible for reviewing the proposal understand these concepts, or will it be necessary to brief them beforehand?

Action: Identify the PRs and SRs

CCMs are required to put in place and maintain a transparent, documented process to nominate the PR. This is one of the minimum requirements that CCMs have to meet, and is a part of the proposal development process that requires very particular care.

For each disease component of the proposal it submits, the CCM can nominate one or more PRs. (The CCM can only nominate; the Global Fund must approve the nomination.)

The Global Fund explains that the requirement concerning the nomination of the PR

lays the critical foundation for developing an interactive, workable, and transparent relationship between the grant's administrator/implementer (the Primary [sic] Recipient (PR)) and its custodian/owner (the CCM). Developing a criteria-based, transparent process to select a PR gives credibility and legitimacy to all parties involved. This is important to ensure that solutions to future programmatic challenges - and there will always be challenges – are not compounded by allegations of impropriety. In other words, an open and fair PR nomination process will help ensure that the best possible PR is selected and … has credibility with all concerned partners.[10]

---

[10] *Clarifications of CCM Requirements* (www.theglobalfund.org/en/ccm/guidelines)

Nominating the PR is one of the critical functions of the CCM. In many ways, the CCM acts as a board of directors, where the board (i.e., the CCM) can choose the organisation (or organisations) that will implement the projects. And Phase 2 Renewal is when the board (CCM) decides whether it wants to continue with the same PR(s).

More and more, CCMs are nominating more than one PR, with each PR being responsible for a portion of the project covered by the proposal. Frequently, the CCM will nominate one government PR and one PR from another sector, usually the NGO sector or the FBO sector. This is known as "dual-track financing."

Dual-track financing is an approach that the Global Fund favours (and strongly recommends) because (a) it is consistent with the Fund's principles of partnership and multi-sector involvement; (b) it can increase a country's absorption capacity; (c) it can accelerate the implementation of projects; (d) it can improve the performance of grants; and (e) it can help to strengthen weaker sectors. Starting in Round 8, the proposal form has required applicants that have not nominated a government PR and a non-government PR to explain why.

Additional guidance concerning the role of the PR and the capacities required of a PR can be found in the guidelines for proposals that the Global Fund produces for each round funding.

The Global Fund's CCM Guidelines[11] do not say anything about the selection of SRs. However, the R9 Guidelines for Proposals said that the Global Fund expects most, if not all, SRs to be identified in the proposal, especially those SRs that will be involved in service delivery. In cases where the SRs were not yet identified at the time the proposal was submitted, the proposal form asked applicants to describe in detail the process that will be used to select SRs.

(In recent rounds of funding, some countries have left SR selection until after the proposal is approved, and have then used a process similar to a request for proposals. Under this sort of arrangement, NGOs and other implementers are selected to contribute to specific targets and objectives that have been fixed during proposal development. If these NGOs and other implementers were not involved in the proposal development process, this approach may be problematic, for several reasons: (a) it is difficult to know whether the objectives are feasible; (b) the start of the project is delayed; (c) this does not create a real partnership process (it is more like a contracting mechanism); and (d) once the implementers are known, it may be necessary to re-do the workplan and budget.)

So, CCMs should assume that they need to have transparent processes in place to both nominate PRs and select SRs, and that these processes should be documented. The CCM will need to develop criteria for the selection of the PRs and SRs.

There are no guidelines in place concerning what selection processes the CCM should use. One possible approach is for the CCM to issue a call for expressions of interest. This call could go out after the in-country submissions have been reviewed, when the CCM already has a good sense of the outline of the proposal it will submit. The call could be issued to a number of organisations identified by the CCM as potential PRs and SRs, or through a public announcement, such as a newspaper advertisement, or both. If this approach is adopted, the process could be managed by the CCM's proposal development team (or a separate committee.)

---

[11] *Guidelines and Requirements for Country Coordinating Mechanisms* (www.theglobalfund.org/en/ccm/guidelines).

Another possible approach is for the proposal development team (or separate committee) to (a) draw up a list of potential PRs and SRs; (b) contact the potential PRs and SRs to determine their interest and to obtain information on their qualifications; and (c) make recommendations concerning which PRs should be nominated and which SRs should be selected. Again, this process would likely be initiated only after the CCM had a sense of what its proposal was going to look like.

A third possible approach would be for the CCM to solicit interest from potential PRs and SRs at the same time as it solicits the in-country submissions; and then have the proposal development team make recommendations concerning which PRs should be nominated and which SRs should be selected.

The relationship between proposal development and PR/SR selection is a very tricky one, because the content of proposals is likely to be closely identified with the capacities of actors who can implement them. For example, if a proposal has a considerable social marketing component, and there is an organisation specialising in that area, it is fairly clear that that organisation should implement the social marketing component (the organisation is probably best placed to write that part of the proposal too). Moreover, it may make sense for that organisation to implement as a PR because its management and financial systems and its procurement systems may lend themselves better to that way of working.

Similarly, if an organisation has particular expertise in providing services to one or more vulnerable populations, it would make sense for that organisation to be involved in developing and implementing that part of the project.

A challenge for CCMs is how to harmonise the ambitions of the CCM with those of potential PRs and SRs. For instance, the CCM may decide to develop a proposal covering all 10 provinces of a country, but potential PRs/SRs may only want to work in five of them (e.g., because that is where they have a history of operations, or because they are not prepared to scale up so rapidly). This example is about geographical coverage, but the same problem could arise in terms of different thematic areas: e.g., a social marketing organisation wants to include a product that the CCM does not want to include; or there is only one agency that is well placed to do AIDS education with good coverage but, because of religious views, it will not agree to include condom distribution. Thus, the CCM will need to spend some time thinking about the best way to come up with a group of PRs and SRs that can collectively do the best job.

> **Key questions related to this action**
>
> $\Rightarrow$ How might our processes need to change in order to respond to the changing guidelines on dual-track PRs and SR selection?
>
> $\Rightarrow$ What does the CCM need to do to identify new candidates to fulfil PR and SR roles?
>
> $\Rightarrow$ Where do PR and SR selection fit in our overall process? Is it important to select them up front, or should they be chosen on the basis of the content of the proposal?

Action: Compile and Submit the Final Proposal

Once all of the components and the generic sections have been drafted to the satisfaction of those responsible, they should be compiled into a single proposal. It may make sense for someone who has not been involved in the detailed writing to check over all of the sections and ensure all information and required attachments are included.

The Global Fund provides detailed guidance on the formats to be used in submitting a final proposal, on language requirements, on the approvals required from CCMs, and on how the proposal should be sent to the secretariat. This will be discussed in more detail in Volume 2 of this guide.

Key questions related to this action

⇒ How will you arrange for CCM members to see the final copy of the proposal and have enough time to provide their input?

⇒ Do arrangements need to be made for translation of the final proposal? (This may be necessary either to ensure that all CCM members can comment on it or to fit in with Global Fund language requirements.)

Action: Maintain Regular Communications

If – as is most often the case – the day-to-day tasks of proposal development are delegated by the CCM to sub-team(s) or resource people, it is important to ensure that the all CCM members stay apprised of the process and of how the proposal content develops. At the same time, the people working on the proposal should not have their hands tied by being required to obtain approval of the full CCM for every single activity or detail of their work.

All CCM members should be well aware of what to expect when they are asked to approve the final proposal. At the same time, it is the responsibility of CCM members to keep on top of the information they receive so that they do not delay the approval process.

It is established good practice – and a Global Fund requirement – to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are kept informed regularly about the process and about how they can participate. Particular efforts may need to be made to communicate with representatives of marginalised groups. CCM members will be expected to communicate information to the constituencies they represent; the CCM should make sure that this is happening.

Key questions related to this action

⇒ If proposal development is delegated by the CCM, what level of information does the CCM require and with what regularity? How is the proposal development team kept accountable to the CCM?

⇒ What mechanisms will be used to ensure that other stakeholders have ongoing access to information regarding the process?

⇒ What steps can be taken to ensure that CCM members and other stakeholders fully understand the information communicated to them?

Managing the Proposal Development Process

CCMs are multi-entity committees, not executive bodies. Although CCMs are responsible for proposal development, trying to have the entire CCM manage the development process can be quite a challenge. During past funding rounds, many CCMs have established smaller proposal development teams (or committees) to do most of the work involved. The roles of these teams can vary and will depend on what is needed in each context. Some suggestions are provided below.

Component-Specific Teams

It is common practice for CCMs to set up a different team to work on each disease component (if they are planning to apply for more than one component). These teams can take on all or several of the following tasks:

- Ensure that a general situation analysis related to the response to the disease is conducted.

- Based on the situational analysis, define the overall focus of the proposal.

- Define the proposal development process that will be followed, complete with timelines.

- Coordinate the process of soliciting and reviewing submissions from a broad range of stakeholders for possible integration into the proposal.

- Write, or oversee the writing of, the final proposal for the component.

- Ensure that the process followed is well documented.

- Present the content of the component-specific proposal to the CCM, and provide clarifications and revisions as required.

The proposal development process may be different for each component.

Proposal Coordination Team

If your CCM does establish a proposal development teams for each component, we suggest that you also consider setting up an additional team to bring the different components together and to coordinate the entire proposal. In order to do this effectively, it may make sense for at least one member of each component-specific team to participate in meetings of the proposal coordination team. The latter can take on all or several of the following tasks:

- Manage the overall process, particularly in relation to timing and setting guidelines for broad-based participation.

- Provide guidance to the component-specific teams on the processes they adopt for developing each component.

- Provide guidance on specific technical issues that need to be addressed by each component, such as procurement, budgeting and M&E.

- Ensure that there is consistency across the different components, particularly in relation to cross-cutting issues such as health systems strengthening and requirements related to counterpart funding.

- Write or oversee the writing of sections of the proposal that are common to all components – for instance those related to CCMs and eligibility.

> **Why overall coordination is important**
>
> For Round 5, one CCM established technical working groups to develop each component of the proposals (HIV/AIDS, TB, malaria). Each component team organised broader consultations with stakeholders interested in each theme, and this worked well in terms of developing the individual components. However, there was almost no effort to harmonize the three components. As a result, there was lots of overlap, particularly with respect to activities designed to strengthen health systems. Although the individual components had strengths, the overall proposal was not a coherent whole.

- Combine the different components into one proposal.
- Present the content of the overall proposal to the CCM, providing clarifications and revisions as requested.
- Ensure that the overall proposal development process is well-documented.
- Obtain the necessary signatures from CCM members.
- Submit the approved proposal to the Global Fund.

(A variation on this approach is to set up additional sub-teams focussing on the technical areas of procurement, budgeting and M&E.)

Membership of Proposal Development Teams

Given the importance of the principle of broad-based representation of all stakeholders, proposal development teams should try to reflect not only technical expertise required but also the perspectives of different sectors and, if possible, different regions. Ensuring that marginalised groups are represented will also help to strengthen the proposal.

Proposal development teams can include non-CCM members, particularly those who have relevant technical expertise and who are available to actively contribute.

The Global Fund encourages applicants to contact the many TS partners that are actively involved in the field of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis or malaria early in the proposal development process. Early contact with these partners is beneficial to both the applicant and the partners, from a resource planning perspective. (See the list of TS partners in the section "Guidance Concerning the Technical Content of Proposals" in Chapter 2: General Information.

In order to be efficient and well-organised, proposal development teams should be small – certainly no larger than ten people. The more members there are, the harder it is to arrange the necessary working meetings and to get agreement on the process. It is worth remembering that having a small core team does not preclude the organisation of larger, open consultations in relation to the process and content of the proposal – indeed, such consultations are encouraged by the Global Fund.

Finally, it is worth noting that team members should participate in their individual capacity. Their responsibility is to ensure that a good quality proposal is produced based on a transparent process, not to ensure that their own organisations or affiliates are well positioned in the proposal.

Use of Consultants

Because CCM members do not always have sufficient time to devote to the development of the proposal, many CCMs decide to hire one or more consultants to help manage the proposal development process or to write the actual proposal. In our experience, this can work well providing the consultant plays a supportive role, and the proposal development team plays a central, coordinating role. What should be avoided is having consultants fly in to write entire proposals when they do not really understand the country well.

CCM Oversight of the Process

Establishing proposal development teams does not diminish the responsibility of the entire CCM for the proposal development process and the proposal itself. It is just a way of enabling the CCM to better manage the process. Indeed, there are certain actions related to the proposal development process that should only be carried out by the full CCM, including the following:

- Make the decision at the outset to submit a proposal to the Global Fund.

- Ensure that the CCM meets the Global Fund's six minimum requirements for CCMs.

- Ensure that proposal development is integrated with existing national or regional processes.

- Approve the overall proposal development process.

- Set up proposal development teams and define their mandates.

- Approve the identification of PRs.

- Approve the final proposal to be submitted to the Global Fund.

Process for Soliciting and Reviewing Submissions

As noted above, the Global Fund requires that CCMs provide an opportunity for interested stakeholders to present submissions for possible inclusion in the CCM's consolidated proposal to the Global Fund. This requirement can be interpreted in a number of ways.

Possible Approaches

One possible approach is for the CCM to issue an open call for submissions without establishing any criteria or issuing any guidance. This is what many CCMs have done. The advantages of this approach are that it allows all interested stakeholders to submit their ideas; and it allows them to make suggestions concerning both what thematic areas should be covered in the proposal and what specific services and activities should be included.

The disadvantages of this approach are that the CCM may receive a large number of submissions, which may make the process very unwieldy; that it may be difficult for the CCM to assemble all the pieces into a coherent whole; and that if only parts of some submissions are eventually incorporated into the proposal, many organisations will have wasted a lot of time and energy and may become disillusioned with the whole process.

Another possible approach is to establish a framework and some criteria prior to issuing the call for submissions. For example, for a Round 6 HIV/AIDS proposal, the CCM in Morocco followed the following process:

1. The CCM developed the broad outline of the proposal – including objectives, SDAs and indicators.

2. The CCM made sure that the outline of the proposal was aligned with the national strategic plan for HIV/AIDS (which had been developed through broad consultations).

3. The CCM put out a call for submissions based on the outline it developed. In their proposals, applicants essentially had to explain how their activities would contribute to the achievement of the overall programme.

4. When it issued the call, the CCM established eligibility criteria covering strategic and programmatic issues, geographic priorities and capacity or experience thresholds for applicants (for example, number of years of experience and levels of donor funds previously managed).

The use of Global Fund SDAs and indicators ensured that it would not be difficult for the CCM to collate accepted submissions into the country coordinated proposal.

While stakeholders were preparing their submissions, the CCM was able to work on elements of the country coordinated proposal (e.g., CCM structure, programmatic and financial gap analysis) that were not dependent on the implementation details.

An interesting point to note is that because the CCM established eligibility criteria for applicants, the call was not "wide-open." On the other hand, the CCM did specify that applicants should aim to produce "umbrella" submissions that included partnerships with smaller organisations that were not eligible to apply on their own.

(Incidentally, this particular proposal was approved for funding.)

A variation on the Moroccan approach would be for the CCM to hold broad consultations in each sector; to develop the broad outlines of a country coordinated proposal; and to then issue a call for submissions. This approach might be particularly appropriate if the country's national strategy for the disease (or diseases) in question has not been developed through broad consultations, or if it has not been recently updated.

But is it necessary to issue an open call for submissions? The Zanzibar CCM followed a process for the HIV/AIDS component of its successful Round 6 proposal that did not involve a call for submissions. The process was as follows:

1. The CCM identified potential implementing partners and sources of technical support.

2. The implementation partners participated in a five-day "design forum" where, supported by resource persons, they reviewed the CCM's Round 5 proposal and identified the goals, objectives, strategies and indicators for the Round 6 proposal.

3. A proposal development group was established to coordinate the planning and writing of the proposal. This 15-member group included representatives from some of the implementing partners and some technical support persons.

4. During the planning and writing of the proposal – a process that took five weeks – consultative meetings were held with implementing partners and development partners.

5. A draft proposal was reviewed by the implementing partners.

For Example:

For Round 4, **Sri Lanka** issued a public notice to invite submissions for inclusion in the country proposal. The CCM established a sub-committee to review and select inputs based on predetermined criteria. A series of workshops and disease-specific technical sub-committees were established to draft the proposal. A draft proposal was then reviewed by the entire CCM, finalised and submitted.

For its Round 5 proposal, the CCM in **Zanzibar** instituted a very participative process, involving over 40 organisations. Two design forums were held, one on HIV prevention and treatment and another on issues affecting children.

In Round 6, the CCM in **Uganda** placed two newspaper advertisements, three weeks apart, and gave potential applicants more than two months to respond.

Also in Round 6, the CCM in **Cambodia** placed three separate newspaper advertisements in both Khmer and English, providing a clear description of the call.

So, while the principle behind the requirement for an open call – to ensure that all sectors can contribute to the development of the proposal – is obviously important, perhaps this principle can be achieved in other ways. The Zanzibar example suggests that the Global Fund is prepared to accept that there are alternatives to an open call.

One of the challenges faced by CCMs is to come up with a process which allows both large and small organisations to participate in a way that does not make the process unwieldy.

Whatever process the CCM adopts, remember that it must be documented and disseminated to interested stakeholders. The description of the process should include the criteria that the CCM will use to review the in-country submissions. If the CCM issues a call for submissions, the review criteria should be included in the call.

Issuing a Call for Submissions

The CCM Guidelines do not provide any guidance concerning how a call for submissions should be made. The Fund's CCM clarifications document says that "some options include publicly announcing a call … via print media, radio, television and website." This appears to assume that the call would be wide open – i.e., that any interested organisation could respond to the call. (This may indeed be the preferred approach. For Round 6, one CCM that we are aware of issued invitations to what it considered to be "established organisations." The danger of that approach is that it leaves it up to the CCM to determine who is eligible, and it risks missing some organisations that may have something useful to contribute.)

The Global Fund has not provided a template for CCMs to use for the in-country submissions. Individual CCMs can always develop their own template, but this is not an easy task. In the absence of any template, some CCMs have asked potential applicants to use the proposal form that the Global Fund has designed for the country coordinated proposals.

This is problematic because the proposal form was not really designed for in-country submissions. For example, there are large sections of the proposal form – relating to the CCM itself and to the national context – that organisations preparing in-country submissions are not in a position to fill out.

In order to help CCMs with this process, Aidspan has prepared a sample template that CCMs can adapt for use in their in-country submissions process. The template has been designed to serve two main functions: (1) to enable the CCM to obtain information that will allow the CCM to make a judgement on the suitability of the proposed project; and (2) to enable the CCM obtain the information in a form that makes it easier to collate into the CCM's country consolidated proposal.

The sample template, as well as a draft guidance note that can be used in conjunction with the template for issuing a call for submissions, is available on the Aidspan website: www.aidspan.org/aidspanpublications. We encourage you to read the accompanying cover note, which discusses various questions to consider when using the template, and which provides advice on how the template can be adapted to different types of call for submissions.

Reviewing Submissions

As noted above, the Global Fund requires that the process for reviewing the in-country submissions must be transparent and documented. The CCM Guidelines also say that "a

broad range of stakeholders, including CCM members and non-members" must be involved in the proposal development process; the Global Fund Secretariat has been interpreting this requirement to mean that both CCM members and non-members must also be involved in the proposal review process.

If, as we suggested above, the CCM has established a proposal development team, this team could be responsible for reviewing the submissions and deciding which submissions or which parts of these submissions will be incorporated into the country coordinated proposal.

Criteria for the review of submissions should be developed and disseminated along with the description of the proposal development process. The CCM may also want to develop a rating system to help assess the submissions. The CCM should provide feedback to all organisations that tendered a submission. To those organisations whose proposals were not accepted, or were only partially accepted, the CCM should explain why this occurred.

Other Issues To Consider

Need for all parties to follow the process

As noted above, the Global Fund's requirement that stakeholders be able to contribute submissions to a country coordinated proposal can be interpreted in different ways. It could mean that the proposal should be built up entirely of approved submissions from interested stakeholders. Alternatively it could mean that the CCM develops a core proposal to which the stakeholder submissions are added.

The difference between these two interpretations is often blurred, because many CCM members come from organisations that have an interest in receiving funding through the proposed project. Because they are CCM members, they may be able to circumvent the submissions process and insert their funding requests directly into the proposal.

Aidspan believes that it is important not only to have a formal, transparent process for receiving submissions, but to ensure that *all* parties follow this process – even government agencies and proposed PRs. Following the process should not be seen as a threat – indeed, it is an opportunity to further improve and validate submissions whether they come from large, established programmes or from small community organisations.

Avoiding conflicts of interest

As noted above, many CCM members represent organisations that are active implementers of HIV, TB and malaria programmes. Their position on the CCM – and their membership of proposal development teams within the CCM – create a risk because, theoretically, they are in a position to ensure that the interests of their organisations are looked after in the proposal that they are helping to develop. This potential conflict of interest can also

---

For example:

In Round 6 proposals submitted to the Global Fund:

- The CCM in **Kenya** included a list of submissions with points awarded to each; and provided detailed reasons for including or excluding ideas from individual proposals.
- The **Rwanda** CCM produced a list of submissions and scored them based on a pre-determined set of criteria.
- The CCM in **Cameroon** provided a list of submissions and gave detailed reasons why they were included or excluded.
- The CCM in **Côte d'Ivoire** provided copies of letters that were sent to various stakeholders inviting them to participate in two workshops focusing on proposal development and the review of in-country submissions. The CCM also submitted a list of participants of the workshops, the workshops' agendas and an action plan for broad stakeholder involvement in the proposal development and submissions review process

arise when organisations represented on the CCM make submissions for inclusion in the proposal. Even non-CCM members who are invited to support the proposal development process as resource people can have potential conflicts of interest if they are affiliated with submitting organisations.

The CCM must therefore take care to minimise any potential conflicts of interest, for instance by ensuring that all those managing the process declare any interests and are excluded from taking decisions related to those interests.

Providing support to potential submitting organisations

CCMs should be particularly interested in ensuring that the needs of poor and marginalised people are met in any proposal that is submitted to the Global Fund. Because of the very nature of poverty and marginalisation, it may be difficult for these groups to ensure that their interests are adequately considered in submissions to the CCM. In addition, some organisations, particularly in the community sector, may lack the capacity to develop good quality, acceptable submissions or may not even have access to information about the process.

CCMs should think about these issues and consider taking specific actions to support groups and organisations that are marginalised. Potential actions include the following:

- Ensure that these groups are aware of the opportunities.

- Ensure that the relevant documents and information are available in local languages and that groups are not marginalised because of geographic or language barriers.

- Demystify some of the jargon related to national responses and the Global Fund.

- Provide resource people to support these groups in the process of developing submissions.

- Design criteria for submissions that are "pro-poor" or that require submissions to include strategies to reach marginalised groups

- Design a submissions process whereby larger, established organisations are expected to partner with smaller and marginalised groups, for instance by acting as a conduit for financial and technical support to these groups (see Morocco example above).

Some of these actions require long-term planning and the investment of resources. As a multi-stakeholder entity, CCMs should be well-positioned to obtain such support.