ICRW

Where Insight and Action Connect

Civil Society Participation in Global Fund
Governance:
Recommendations and Actionable Items

Table of Contents

Civil Society Participation in Global Fund Governance
Recommendations and Actionable Items

I thank the NGO and activist communities. I did not know them well before taking this job. I have come to be their biggest fan. They are a major reason why the Global Fund exists. Their voice is clear, consistent and honest. They organize their delegations to this Board better than anyone else. And they have been a constant support to the work of the Global Fund. Constant support does not mean telling us things that we want to hear or patting us on the back. Constant support means honest and constructive comments and activity focused on getting the job done.

<div align="right">Richard Feachem, Global Fund Executive Director
January 29, 2003</div>

In honoring Richard Feachem's call for honest and constructive comments and activity, civil society representatives must advocate on their own behalf to improve and enhance civil society's participation in the Global Fund.

<div align="right">Civil Society Representative, June 2004</div>

Introduction

The design and implementation of the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (Global Fund) has been an extraordinary process that has included civil society in an unprecedented manner. Before creation of the Global Fund, civil society had not formally been included in the decision-making processes of international organizations. But with its creation, representatives of Northern and Southern non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and affected communities became full members of the Global Fund's board, and they are expected to be active members of the country coordinating mechanisms (CCMs), which submit country proposals for funding to the Global Fund. The decision by the Global Fund to formally include participation in this way – in part a direct result of consistent and effective advocacy by civil society – was greeted with enthusiasm by civil society organizations (CSOs) the world over. Keenly aware of the important precedent this action has set, CSOs are monitoring the governance of the Global Fund very carefully to determine the actual value of such participation and to extract lessons from this experience for possible application to other international entities.

With support from the Ford Foundation, the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) is undertaking a two-year research and advocacy initiative to capture these

lessons and develop recommendations for strengthening civil society participation in Global Fund decision making by identifying factors that enable or constrain effective and meaningful participation in governance. ICRW is also examining the extent to which the Global Fund has integrated gender considerations into its operations and the role that civil society has played in this regard.

During initial research, ICRW conducted a series of interviews with key informants, reviewed other consultative mechanisms and processes for civil society engagement, and reviewed a wide range of key Global Fund documents, including case study documentation of 20 selected CCMs conducted between November 2003 and April 2004. The following paper both reports and builds on ICRW's preliminary conclusions developed in June 2004, and offers key recommendations and actions for implementation to enhance and fortify civil society's ability to actively and effectively participate in the Global Fund's operations and governance.

EVALUATION OF CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION:
BACKGROUND AND TALKING POINTS

Overall, evidence suggests that civil society participation is promising but uneven across the different structures of the Global Fund. Active and effective civil society participation requires commitment by leadership; integration into all structures, polices and processes; adequate resources to facilitate participation; and transparency in decision-making. Each of these requirements may be present to some degree within the Global Fund process. But, to optimize civil society participation, each of these requirements must be fulfilled in a more thorough, cohesive and consistent manner.

Leadership

The top leadership of the Global Fund, including both the executive director and the chair of the board, has expressed commitment to enabling the participation of civil society representatives. The board chair has been widely applauded for creating a supportive environment for civil society participation in board deliberations. However, the board chair and the secretariat must ensure that this commitment is solidified throughout the Global Fund. Both the Global Fund and civil society should systematize the monitoring and evaluation of civil society participation in Global Fund governance to ensure the factors that enable meaningful civil society participation are strengthened. Supporting the development of an independent biennial report on best practices of civil society participation in governance will serve as a guiding document for future staff and board members.

One of the key principles of the Global Fund is support for "programs that reflect national ownership and respect country-led formulation and implementation processes." To be most effective, this approach requires a capacity for consensus building, proposal development, program implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. In many countries, participation in such processes is a relatively new opportunity for civil society, one that requires CSOs to develop new technical knowledge, and strategic and process skills. The Global Fund should increase its commitment to offering training materials and opportunities to increase civil society's capacity to participate effectively at the board level and in the CCMs.

Leadership and the Community Coordinating Mechanisms

Civil society participation in CCMs has varied from country to country, but on the whole it has been far less effective and meaningful than what has been advocated by civil society at the board level. This is true for a variety of reasons.

First, the commitment of the Global Fund's top leadership to civil society participation is not reflected at the country level where many governments lack the experience or willingness to work with civil society organizations.

Second, CSO participation in the proposal development process at the CCM level is difficult to assess because the Global Fund has not pushed for indicators beyond a review of both CCM membership and members' signatures on proposal submissions.

Third, there is evidence that stigma and discrimination at the country level has led to exclusion of some AIDS-affected groups – notably women and drug users. The experiences of the Kenya Women's Organization against AIDS (KENWA) and Sanaa Art Promotions are a good case in point. Both organizations received their Round I grants by applying directly to the Global Fund, and both reported discrimination in being selected for the CCM until the Global Fund intervened. Sanaa[1] still reports getting CCM meeting notices so late that it makes attendance impossible – sometimes notices arrive after the meeting has been held.

And fourth, inadequate attention to procedures for meeting notification impedes participation – even where stigma and discrimination are not at issue. For example, the Rwanda CCM study noted that for three of the past six meetings, notice was only given the day before. The Rwanda study included a recommendation to call meetings with sufficient notice and provide information in a timely way.

---

[1] Sanaa is a group that uses visual and performing arts to promote social development in East African communities.

Integration

The issue of civil society participation in the CCMs has been an important focus for the board, which requested that the Global Fund commission case studies of 20 country CCMs. The Global Fund secretariat also recently contracted with the POLICY Project of the Futures Group to carry out assessments of all the CCMs within the next year. The majority of CCM case studies already undertaken recommend a range of policies and processes to strengthen civil society participation. These include defining more clearly the role and expectations of civil society representatives and developing indicators to monitor civil society participation.

But to optimize participation, these same studies also indicate that once these policies and procedures are developed, defined, and clarified, there is a pronounced need to *integrate* them throughout Global Fund structures.

A 2004 country case study of Cambodia recommended that an agreed-upon proportion of funding within the CCM be set aside for governance issues, including strengthening the meaningful participation of civil society. This same study supported developing a set of *governance indicators* for CCMs and identifying an independent body, or ombudsman, to use these indicators to monitor the participation process. Additionally, the study encouraged the use of impartial facilitators or representatives – perhaps from an outside NGO – to help ensure that the voices of civil society, including persons living with HIV/AIDS (PLHA), are heard at CCM meetings.

The Cambodia study also encouraged the expansion of CCM membership to include a representative from a Cambodia-based NGO working with marginalized and vulnerable groups. Similarly, the Vietnam case study recommended that PLHA might best be represented by two people – one, a PLHA known to be an active community member and the other, an individual from an international private voluntary organization (PVO) strongly involved in supporting PLHA and able to represent their interests.

The findings from the case studies and the online debate leading up to the XV International AIDS Conference at Bangkok influenced decision making during the ninth board meeting held in Arusha, Tanzania on November 18 and 19, 2004. At that meeting, the board made considerable changes to the composition, participation, and governance requirements for the CCMs. The newly approved requirements include that:

- every CCM must have at least one representative of people living with HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, or malaria;
- civil society members must be selected by their own constituents through a transparent process;
- the processes to request and review proposal submissions, nominate the principal recipient (PR), and ensure broad participation in all CCM activities must be transparent; and

- a system to mitigate conflict of interest must be put in place in cases where the CCM chair and PR are from the same entity.

Although weaker than the original requirements advocated by civil society organizations prior to the eighth board meeting, these new requirements aim to strengthen the CCMs and improve grant oversight. Effective immediately, all CCMs with grants being considered for Phase II renewals or wishing to submit Round V proposals must be in compliance with the newly adopted requirements by June 2005.

Integration has also surfaced as an issue within civil society delegations. The current 2005 call for delegation board nominations includes *terms of reference* (TOR) that address board functions, mandates, working methods, qualifications, criteria for selection, term length, cessation of appointment, and the application process. However, there is a gap in the TOR because the conflict of interest issue is not addressed therein.

Recent Partnership Forum list-serve discussions flag this gap as an area of concern for some community members – particularly with regard to the delegation selection process and the need to expand the selection committee. Civil society is encouraged to develop and include in these TOR a provision to reduce conflicts of interest in civil society delegation selection and participation. In fact, based on the recommendation of an NGO network, the CCM in India decided that NGO membership should be limited to two years and that NGO members should not apply for funds.

Some lessons learned from the country case studies about CCM participation may apply to civil society delegations as more formal processes for their constitution are implemented. For example, the Indonesia case study recognized that high-level individuals might not make the best choice as delegates because it was unlikely they could participate at a consistent and engaged level. One solution put forth was to invite *institutions* to become delegates and require them to nominate two individuals – thus increasing the likelihood that at least one person would be available to attend meetings.

Attendance was also flagged as an important issue in the Honduras study, which reported that inadequate attention was being paid to ensuring civil society representatives are present at meetings. The study cited the following illustration: The Commission Departmental del Valle was chosen as one of the four NGO representative members of the Honduras CCM because it is located in a rural area. But the representative has been unable to attend CCM meetings for lack of a travel budget.

Resource Constraints

Beyond these issues of commitment by leadership and inadequate integration, civil society participation in CCMs – particularly grassroots participation – is constrained by a general lack of financial resources. The negative impact of this resource deficit becomes

acutely apparent with a scan of technology infrastructure and skills. The poorer the setting, the greater the technology gap – and the greater the disparity between Global Fund participants who can access and exchange vital information, and those who cannot.

Resource constraints also limit the amount of time that civil society representatives can dedicate to fulfilling their responsibilities as board members and alternates. This point is especially critical now in these first few years of Global Fund operations, when their input is greatly needed to help create the very tools required for effective civil society participation in governance. Without these tools in place – processes for effective communication, consultation, and deliberation – civil society board members cannot be genuinely representative. And without these tools, no effective channel will exist for providing insights and understanding based on the experience of civil society. The Ad Hoc Working Group for Technical Support also discussed funding issues. The recommendations should be thoroughly reviewed and implemented as appropriate.

Resources to support civil society participation in Global Fund governance have come from civil society organizations, the Global Fund, bilateral donors, and private foundations. Recently, the Global Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS (GNP+) and the International Council for AIDS Service Organizations (ICASO) secured a grant from the Open Society Institute (OSI) to support the developing country delegation. A review of this support should be conducted within the next year to evaluate whether it meets the delegation's challenges of fulfilling its governance responsibilities, both at the board level and at the country level.

Transparency of Decision Making and Operations

The Global Fund has worked diligently to ensure that its decision making is transparent. The main vehicle for implementing this commitment is its policy of posting all key documents on the Web site in a timely fashion. However, despite an unprecedented openness to enabling civil society to engage with the Global Fund in an ongoing manner, key informants raised a number of concerns, including these:

- Civil society board and committee members do not always receive key documents in a timely manner.
- Civil society board and committee members often have significant technological difficulties in accessing the documents.
- Board documents are not made public until after board meetings.
- There has been no public disclosure of the scoring form used by the technical review panel (TRP) to rate proposals.

- The TRP report on proposals is not posted separately on the Web site, but as part of the board docket and can be difficult to find.
- The TRP report is not available prior to the board meeting, which limits the ability of civil society to have input into the final approval of proposals by the board.

In addition, systems for a two-way flow of information between civil society participants on the board and those at the country level are not well developed. This has resulted in a critical gap in communication between board representatives and the broader civil society. As described earlier, additional resources are needed so that regular and effective channels of information and exchange can be established, enabling civil society board members and delegates to consult with civil society at large in a timely manner on issues related to Global Fund policies and operations.

The 2004 Peru country case study highlighted the need for such increased communication. But, the study cautioned that in-country communication exchanges should not take place between a board member and a sole member of the CCM. Instead, it was recommended that board representatives communicate with either the executive secretariat of the CCM, or all CCM representatives – or both.

The Global Fund has three individuals who serve as civil society communication focal points. But the task of establishing communication networks and systems while simultaneously providing support for current board operations is unmanageable. It would be ideal if the Global Fund could hire an independent, outside technical support person – selected by the CSOs – to backstop the communication focal points. If not possible, at the very minimum, the secretariat should assign a staff person to provide this support. Doing either would ensure that communication focal points have adequate time and technical skills to distribute information and policy decisions in a timely and consistent manner.

At the CCM level there are numerous concerns about communication and transparency. An attempt to address these concerns was made at the ninth board meeting when a new guideline was adopted requiring that the processes to request and review proposal submissions, nominate the principal recipient (PR), and ensure broad participation in all CCM activities must be transparent.

But the issue of transparency is still paramount for civil society members of the CCMs. In particular, the failure of PRs to consistently share progress updates and the lack of clarity about the role different CCM members play in monitoring program implementation were repeatedly highlighted in interviews with key stakeholders and noted in CCM studies.

The confusion over roles exists – as evidenced in the following excerpts from country case studies – even though Global Fund guidelines clearly state that the CCM role includes monitoring the implementation of activities within Global Fund approved programs. And it exists, even though the guidelines further state that the CCM role extends to approving major changes in implementation plans, as necessary.

The 2004 Indonesia country case study reports that the CCM is not responsible for preparing proposals, quarterly reports, procurement plans and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) reports, but it does need to learn how to review such documents, provide feedback, and contribute suggestions for improving them. The study stressed that so far, M&E is "totally lacking. The GFATM expects the CCM to 'monitor the implementation of approved proposals.' Because of the lack of governance procedures and terms of reference, the CCM is not prepared to carry out these functions. In fact, it has very limited M&E capability to begin with."

The study continued, "aside from the 'performance indicators,' there does not seem to be a system in place for overall monitoring and no plans, much less procedures, for evaluating the effect of these programs on health. There is also some confusion about signature requirements. The leading financial agency (LFA) believes that only the CCM chair needs to sign documents that are submitted to Geneva."
However, some of the people interviewed believe that the Global Fund requires all CCM members to sign off on proposals, reports and other documents. According to the Indonesia study, this has caused a major logistical problem for the Indonesian CCM chair. Since so many members do not attend the CCM meetings, the chair has to track them down at their offices and homes to get the needed signatures. One respondent remarked that the PLHA member was literally "on her deathbed at a hospital" when the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) team came to get her signature on a progress report. A small sign-off committee would decrease both the burden of obtaining excessive signatures and the possibility of conflict of interest.

Most CCM members are probably unaware that they have an oversight and monitoring responsibility. Some members said they thought that their involvement ended with the submission of proposals. The Indonesia study recommends that each CCM develop a set of standard operating procedures, such as a TOR that would also include criteria for membership and for selection of the PR and sub-PRs, management tools for reviewing proposals, quarterly reports, and so forth. Technical assistance would need to be provided if the CCMs were unable to create TORs on their own. Additionally, both the Vietnam and India case studies highlighted the need to develop mechanisms for overseeing implementation in ways that enable CCM members to participate effectively in this role.

The India case study raised concerns about two specific deficiencies in communication: stakeholders are not adequately provided with information about the Global Fund and the CCM, and documentation for CCM decision making on draft proposals is not readily available. In the first instance, NGOs in the three states visited for the case study reported that they were almost completely in the dark about Global Fund processes – apart from information they were able to obtain on their own and circulate among

themselves. They also reported that the Ministry's Web site did not enable them to be involved effectively. The India study recommended that the CCM seek ways to improve communications both within the CCM, and between the CCM and stakeholders.

The Vietnam case study also acknowledged that information sharing among the CCM representatives is weak, and highlighted the need to develop and strengthen the feedback system or information sharing process so that each representative can better communicate with his or her constituencies. According to the Vietnam study, there is no advance notice of meetings within the CCM – including advance circulation of agendas. This has a negative impact on attendance. Specifically, absenteeism is greater among members who are difficult to reach, and meeting documentation, such as minutes of meetings, is distributed late and unequally among members, leaving them insufficient time to read and make comments. Neither the PR's implementation or progress reports, nor information on specific meetings with the fund portfolio manager is shared. Consequently, the level of understanding about the CCM process is decreased both within – and outside – the CCM.

The CCM is viewed as "a black box" from outside. And according to this case study, there is no information sharing process to other stakeholders in the country, dissemination channels are not identified, and no clear reporting systems have been defined.

Integration of Gender Concerns

Lack of a systemic integration on gender issues represents a significant gap in the Global Fund's structure, policies and processes. Recognition of the importance of gender concerns is articulated in the framework document. It states the Global Fund will support proposals that address gender inequality. To this end, the Global Fund includes a section in its requests for proposals (RFPs) that calls for submissions to include a discussion of how gender equality will be mainstreamed throughout the program proposed. In Round IV, specific attention is drawn to – and proposals are instructed to address – gender inequality as it relates to access.

However, the Global Fund has not thoroughly reviewed or implemented the recommendations developed by the Gender Working Group. A review of both the paper trail leading up to the establishment of the Global Fund and official Global Fund documents raises a number of concerns regarding the extent and nature of Global Fund attention to gender and gender issues:

- **Women's organizations did not involve themselves in a systematic way** in the discussions leading to the establishment of the Global Fund. Civil society organizations failed to identify key issues that needed to be addressed to ensure that a gender perspective was integrated into Global Fund policies, programs, and operations. Civil society recommendations focused primarily on ensuring gender

balance in the structure of the Global Fund and its related bodies. Women's organizations at both the global and in-country level consistently fail to include HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria as part of their advocacy platforms.

- **An agenda on key gender issues has not been articulated by either the board or the secretariat.** The Partnership Forum addressed gender issues and reported its recommendations at the 8th board meeting in November, 2004. These recommendations should be reviewed and implemented as appropriate.

- The attention given to gender concerns thus far has focused on **gender balance in representation and not on ensuring gender expertise** in decision making and operations. Ten of 19 CCM studies reviewed made no mention of gender. Of the remaining nine, six reported poor representation by women in the CCMs; only three noted good gender balance. Both the technical review panels and the CCMs are notably lacking in gender balance, with many CCMs lacking representation from the Women's Ministry or women's NGOs.

- Civil society criteria for board members and alternates include a requirement that candidates be "gender sensitive." However, **there is limited gender expertise among civil society board representatives, alternates and focal points.** Additionally, not enough attention has been given to the gender expertise that is on the board**.** An example is the affected communities' delegation that includes representatives of women's groups whose members are living with HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis or malaria.

- **Country proposals demonstrate scant evidence of any systematic attempt to address gender issues** through program design. A preliminary scan of 37 countries indicates that programs targeting women primarily focus on mother-to-child transmission (MTCT). Specific gender constraints in access to VCT or ARV treatment, for example, are not referenced. Proposals for education programs are silent with respect to both gender norms that increase the vulnerability of men and women, and how these factors can be addressed. **There is an almost universal lack of attention to gender concerns in the 20 country case studies recently conducted by consultants for the Global Fund.**

- *?* **Despite the direct and indirect links of violence against women and HIV/AIDS risk, there is no focus on violence against women** with the exception of a few proposals from Colombia, Costa Rica, and Croatia. Similarly, with the exception of the Dominican Republic, **economic issues related to women's vulnerability or access to care and treatment are not mentioned** or incorporated into program interventions. The issue of property and inheritance rights for women is completely ignored.

- *?* **Sex-disaggregated data is not uniformly collected.** The monitoring and evaluation toolkit developed by the Global Fund recommends collection of sex-disaggregated data for certain components but does not require it as such.

<div align="center">RECOMMENDATIONS</div>

For Strengthening Commitment by Leadership

? Ensure that current and future board chairs and executive directors sustain the Global Fund's commitment to enabling meaningful civil society participation.

Actionable Items:
- The board should support an independent biennial review to measure civil society participation and best practices for civil society participation in governance.
- When the recently approved board committee[2] formulates its policy recommendations related to technical assistance and capacity development at the country level, it should include measures to strengthen the capacity of both government and civil society to collaborate effectively in governance processes. The committee should also offer observations about what is needed to strengthen this capacity at the board level.

? Strengthen CCM guidelines to include principles related to creating conditions that enable meaningful civil society participation.

Actionable Items:
- When the secretariat develops auditable standards for benchmarking CCM performance,[3] it should include concrete measures or indicators of effective and meaningful civil society participation. Such indicators would include:

- the diversity of civil society representation – including PLWHA representation – on the CCMs;

- the timely access to information by civil society representatives on the CCM;

- documentation of civil society attendance at CCM meetings, with particular attention paid to the number of civil society representatives who attend meetings at least 50 percent of the time;

- the number of civil society proposals submitted to CCMs; and

- the number of consultations held by civil society representatives with their

---

[2] See minutes of the 8th Global Fund board meeting, June 2004.
[3] The board made the request of the secretariat at its June 2004 meeting.

constituent groups.

- Require all CCMs to develop a set of guidelines for selection criteria and compositional make-up. Additionally, these guidelines should include a conflict of interest statement.

? Civil society organizations should, in particular, evaluate the process by which they have selected board members and alternates, and identify ways to expand the number, increase diversity, and strengthen overall capacity and expertise of civil society organizations involved in the governance process.

Actionable Item:
- Civil society representatives should enhance their current TOR to include a Conflict of interest statement.

For Strengthening Resources

? The three civil society delegations should consider forming a joint task force to evaluate the level of financing needed to enhance developing-country civil society participation in global fund governance and operations.

Actionable Item:
- An evaluation should be conducted within the next year to determine whether the funding recently secured by the Open Society Institute (OSI) for the developing country delegation is sufficient to fulfill its governance responsibilities at the board and country levels. As part of this evaluation, a needs assessment should be conducted to identify the activities this funding should support. This evaluation should be presented to the foundations delegation.

? Governmental and private donors should review their support to date for strengthening civil society's capacity for effective participation with an eye to optimizing and expanding future support.

Actionable Item:
- The CSO board members should request that donors review and analyze their support of CSO participation within the next two months, so that the newly formed CSO task force can meet with donors to discuss the focus of future financing and ways to expand it.

For Improving Transparency of Decision Making and Operations

? Improve communication between the board and civil society representatives, and among civil society representatives.

Actionable Items:

- At the very least within the next six months, the board should perform a communications audit for the entire organization that measures communication effectiveness within the secretariat, board, and civil society structures at the country and board levels. This audit should assess technology needs and identify means of ensuring easier communication between the secretariat and civil society delegates. For example, Web postings must be timely, consistent, and accessible. At least three different modes of communication, such as Web postings, e-mail distribution and mailings, should be made available.

- Increase transparency of the proposal approval process by disclosing the scoring form used to evaluate proposals and directly posting the TRP report prior to each board meeting.

? Improve communication between civil society representatives and field level civil society organizations.

Actionable Item:

- The Governance and Partnership Committee, in collaboration with civil society delegations, should develop a needs assessment and capacity building plan for the civil society communication focal points. This plan should include providing each communication focal point with technical support staff.

? Ensure that principal recipients share progress reports, monitoring and evaluation reports, and updates with CCMs.

Actionable Item:

- A small committee devoted to reviewing and signing off on all progress reports and updates prior to their distribution to the secretariat should be developed within all CCMs, and should include at least one civil society member. To avoid conflict of interest, the principal recipient, sub-recipients, and representatives involved in the development of the proposal should not sit on this committee.

For Integrating Gender Concerns into Global Fund Policies

? The Board and Secretariat should increase gender expertise within the Global Fund.

Actionable Items:

- At a minimum during the 10th board meeting, the board should instruct both the Governance and Partnership (GPC) and Monitoring, Evaluation, Finance and Audit (MEFA) committees to jointly draft a gender action plan for presentation

at the 11th board meeting. The gender action plan should provide for integration of gender analysis throughout Global Fund operations, including policy, planning, monitoring, and evaluation. The action plan should also add a requirement that CCM representatives have gender expertise or can bring a gender perspective to their work. The action plan should draw on existing civil society's gender expertise and include, but not be limited to the following steps:

1. The board should train its staff in gender analysis. At a minimum, all portfolio managers should be trained within the next six months.

2. The board, through the GPC, should ensure sufficient gender expertise within the TRP so that all proposals are reviewed by at least one gender expert before the next round of proposals. The TRP should integrate priorities identified by the Global Coalition on Women and AIDS as a basic framework for highlighting critical issues to be addressed by country proposals.

3. The secretariat should develop a handbook to assist CCMs in integrating gender perspectives in their operations, proposals, and program development, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

4. Develop a team among portfolio managers within the secretariat to assess whether proposed program activities have a gender neutral, gender sensitive or gender transformative impact on women.

- At an absolute minimum, the board must immediately require sex-disaggregated indicators for each program activity in country proposals; incorporate gender-sensitive indicators as part of the Global Fund's Monitoring and Evaluation toolkit; and include gender indicators as part of the plan for overall evaluation of the Global Fund.