



**THE GLOBAL FUND**  
to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

---

**Report of the Governance and Partnership Committee**

**ANNEX 4**

T  
**Partnership Forum**

**Outline:** In January, 2003, the Board endorsed the recommendation to hold a Partnership Forum in the first half of 2004. This paper presents a proposal for the Partnership Forum which includes discussion of the aims and objectives, format and organization including costs and location. Many of these aspects can be further elaborated and discussed at later Board meetings. The essential decision points are outlined below.

**Decisions Points:**

The Committee recommends that the Board:

1. **Decide** on a location for the Forum.
2. **Mandate** the Chair of the Board to establish a Steering Committee for the Forum.
3. **Mandate** the Secretariat to proceed with the process for contracting a conference organizer for the Forum.

## INTRODUCTION

1. At the Fourth Board meeting, the Governance and Partnership Committee was requested to develop a comprehensive proposal for the Partnership Forum and present this to the Fifth Board Meeting. Within the parameters provided for in the By-Laws (reproduced below as Exhibit 1), the Committee presents here a blueprint for the Partnership Forum, including review of proposed locations, initial indications of cost and meeting size and some proposals on content and programme design.

### 1. AIMS and OBJECTIVES

1. The aims of the Partnership Forum should be threefold:

1. It should serve as a **public forum of accountability** for the Fund and should be an opportunity for the Fund Board and Secretariat to listen to feedback from stakeholder voices to hear an 'outside' assessment of the Fund's activities to date; this stocktaking should include both progress reports from the Secretariat on what has been achieved and reports from the 'frontline' on the realities of implementation. To this end the Forum needs to ensure a broad range of voices are heard, providing access to those who may otherwise have difficulty accessing the governance processes of the Fund.
2. It should serve as **an opportunity for high level re-commitment and coordination** to the goals of the Fund – scaling-up, reduction of disease, improved economic prospects. It should not be an overt pledging opportunity although leaders may wish to use it as such, but it could be used as an opportunity for resource mobilization activities.
3. It should provide the opportunity for **open debate on policy issues** with a view to capturing advice and input from a broader group of people concerned with the prevention, care, treatment and eradication of the diseases. However, these sessions should seek to avoid policy debates on all aspects of the Fund's activities but rather focus on a few of the most critical areas for discussion within the existing framework.

2. The Partnership Forum should not move outside the parameters for the Fund defined by the Bylaws, nor should it become a forum to discuss the diseases and the validity of certain interventions for the diseases.

3. Given the broad inclusiveness of the Forum and the fact that it is specifically conceived as an opportunity for advocacy, debate and testimony, it is not advisable or necessary to aim for concrete deliverables. The Forum is not a decision making body, it has no formal role in the direct policy and decision making of the Board. But it is an important public acknowledgement of the broad range of stakeholders and an opportunity for them to be heard. The Fund should aim at capturing the main themes to emerge from the meeting for consideration at a formal session of the Board which will follow the Forum, but it may prove fruitless to aim for a declaration or 'resolution'.

## **2. FORMAT**

In view of these aims the following format seems appropriate. The format could be adapted depending on whether a Board meeting precedes or follows the Forum.

### **1. Duration and Structure:**

A three day meeting is proposed.

#### **Day One:**

Theme: Voices from the Frontline

A managed and coordinated feedback series comprised of panels, open fora and organized debates about actual 'delivery' in-country.

Is the Fund achieving its aims? How are funds actually flowing at country level? Has the Fund 'made a difference'? Is the Fund innovative? How involved is civil society? Have we proved to be 'additional'? What are the lessons learned?

Feedback should come from people/organizations outside the direct membership of the Board but directly involved in implementation at country level. The Secretariat should have the opportunity to present comprehensive report backs focusing on the key areas of priority defined for the Forum.

#### **Day Two:**

Theme: Policy Directions

The second day introduces a much more focused and forward looking section of the meeting which will target specific areas of Global Fund policy and open them for debate. Various formats can be used: workshops, panel discussions and debates, question and answer sessions with Board and Secretariat members, interactive teleconference sessions with regions, on-line Q&A.

Each session will have a convener who will submit a short synthesized record of the main points of the discussion to the Fund for reference and inclusion in the report to the Board.

During Day 1 and 2 it is strongly suggested that accommodation be made for regional meetings to facilitate an exchange of ideas at this level. These should not necessarily be part of the formal programme.

#### **Day Three:**

Theme: Leadership in the Global Fight

The first half of the final day should be devoted to feedback from the first two days. Session facilitators should reflect the issues raised in their session but not necessarily provide particular recommendations.

Thereafter, the high level plenary will take place where leaders from all sectors: political, business, multilateral, civil society, faith-based, social should be convened to publicly recommit themselves to the Fund and to the objectives of the Fund.

This is part of the function of the Forum, to mobilize and sustain this commitment and should provide a high point on which to end the meeting.

## 2. Links to Board Meeting

The majority recommendation is to link the Forum to the first Board meeting of 2004. The three day meeting would then precede the two day Board meeting. This has several advantages:

1. It will serve as an important reality check before the Board meeting and will provide the Board with excellent feedback on what is happening at grassroots level.
2. All Board Members need to attend the Forum and it is a wasted opportunity to be in one place and not convene a meeting since there will in any case be normal Board business to deal with.
3. Logistically, it makes practical and financial sense.

The disadvantages are:

1. There will be insufficient time for the outcomes of the Forum to be digested adequately for formal inclusion onto a Board agenda.
2. For Board Members who wish to attend both events it means a full week away from the office (this is mitigated by the fact that many Board members may want to come for just the final day of the Forum which will give them an overview of the first two days and they can also be there for the high level session).

## 3. Preparation and follow-up

In order to be successful and to ensure that the Forum discussions are well-prepared and meaningful, there will need to be a great deal of preparatory work in country to focus the discussion. As part of the preparatory phase it is suggested that technology is used intensively to ensure broad outreach: online discussions, regional video and teleconferences, email debates and so on.

Similarly, these mechanisms could be used as part of the follow-up process. The Board will have to show in the decisions of the subsequent meeting(s) that the views expressed at the Forum have been taken seriously and addressed. Accommodation will have to be made for areas that cannot be reached by this form of communication.

## 4. Attendance:

1. The attendance of the Forum needs to be controlled for it to have any practical value. This is a challenge in that the Forum is intended to allow for very broad representation that goes beyond the representation structure of the Board (it should be a

communication channel for those stakeholders who are not represented elsewhere in the governance structure).

2. Suggestions have been made to keep participation under 500, but realistically it would seem appropriate to aim for an upper limit of 800 - 1000.

3. The most difficult decision will be how to select/limit participation. Some experience from other similar fora suggests using national/international representational structures to convey invitations and/or to limit access to a specific number per country. Others simply send out invitations and rely on conference costs and attendance costs to limit numbers. Both of these approaches have their limitations.

4. Since the aim of the Forum is to encourage attendance of those stakeholders not normally heard, special attention will in any case have to be given to the funding and facilitation of attendance of marginalized groups, and those who cannot fund travel and accommodation for such events.

5. It has been suggested that use be made of the formal structures of the Board to facilitate attendance, i.e. either the Board Constituencies or the CCMs. The disadvantage of this approach is that it is unlikely to yield a strong representation of those who are, in any case, outside of these structures. A mixed approach seems advisable.

6. The following broad lines of participation are therefore proposed:

<b>Proposed breakdown of participants</b>		
	<b>Proposal 1</b>	<b>Proposal 2</b>
Recipients (drawn from grant countries at sub-recipient and below level, including beneficiaries)	350	300
Researchers	100	80
Private Sector (incl. drug companies)	70	50
Foundations	20	15
Donor countries	30	20
Board	70	50
Civil society/activists (non-recipient countries)	20	15
Invited guests/speakers	30	25
Press	20	15
Secretariat	40	30
	<b>750</b>	<b>600</b>

7. For the recipient group, which should make up at least 50% of the total participants, it is suggested that each recipient Board constituency be mandated to invite 20 participants who should be drawn from grant countries at sub-recipient and below level, including beneficiaries. It is recommended, if possible, that there should be no more than 2 from any one country.

8. The remaining recipient participants will be identified through the Secretariat's Fund Portfolio networks.

### **3. ORGANISATION**

The Partnership Forum will be a major international event. The Secretariat does not have the capacity to organize such a complex program; the following organizational structure is therefore suggested:

#### **1. Steering Committee**

To ensure appropriate leadership the Forum should be managed by a high level Steering Committee of no more than 10 people. The Board may wish to keep the membership flexible but the initial proposal is as follows:

The Steering Committee should be led by the Chair of the Board, or his designee, and should comprise the Board Vice Chair (or his designee), plus one additional Board Member from each block, as well as a representative from the Communities constituency and the NGOs (given the nature of the Forum), the Executive Director and relevant Secretariat staff, and a commercial conference organizer (hired by competitive bid).

It is suggested for coherence that the Board representatives on the Steering Committee be drawn from the membership of the Governance and Partnership Committee. In any case the Committee should request regular updates from the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee should convene as a matter of urgency after the decisions of the June Board meeting and commence with organizational activities.

#### **2. The Conference Organizer**

This individual/company should be:

- Hired by competitive bid;
- Internationally reputed and experienced;
- Able to mobilize Global Fund partners;
- Experienced in health/development area;

The Conference Organizer will take care of all logistical arrangements related to the venue and accommodation for the event, as well as any side events (displays, social events etc).

#### **3. Timing and Venue**

The Forum should coincide with the first meeting of the Global Fund Board at the end of March or early April 2004. Exhibit 3 shows some of the meetings scheduled for 2004, at this stage March-April does not seem to pose any particular problem in terms of scheduling.

For a meeting in March-April 2004 to be feasible, it is urgent that the Board decide on a venue in June 2003. It is strongly recommended that the venue be in Africa since the

Global Fund in-country Board meeting this year is in Asia, and Africa is currently the epicenter of the three diseases.

The following considerations should be given in selecting a venue:

1. Logistical capacity: conference venue, hotel rooms, transport, international accessibility
2. Local political commitment to the Fund and fight against diseases
3. Added value of local environment (other high profile synchronicity, parallel events etc)
4. Technological capacity: connectivity (satellite, internet, video and interactive capacity)

The proposals currently on the table are:

1. Arusha, Tanzania
2. Cape Town, South Africa
3. Nairobi, Kenya

Exhibit 2 below provides a cost comparison of the venues. The differences in cost are negligible. There are additional considerations to be taken into account:

Venue	Advantages	Disadvantages
Arusha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 'real' Africa</li> <li>- malaria area</li> <li>- more intimate &amp; informal venue</li> <li>- Tanzania a start-up country with extensive political commitment</li> <li>- attractive surroundings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- more expensive and remote to get to</li> <li>- venue capacity really peaks at 800</li> <li>- local capacity may be limited (technology infrastructure etc)</li> <li>- will be an organizational challenge</li> </ul>
Cape Town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- easy, cheaper travel access</li> <li>- world class facilities and conference venue but still good value for money</li> <li>- easy access to excellent services and local capacity</li> <li>- GF Fund recipient</li> <li>- attractive surroundings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not 'real' Africa...</li> <li>- other attractions and large city mean focus of conference more dispersed</li> </ul>
Nairobi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- easy travel access</li> <li>- international conference centre (if available)</li> <li>- GF Fund recipient</li> <li>- ample hotel space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- may have to use a hotel as the venue</li> <li>- other attractions and large city mean focus of conference more dispersed</li> </ul>

#### 4. Costs

1. The costs for the Partnership Forum can only be estimated at this stage but the best guess estimates are attached in Exhibit 2. Table 1 shows the costs taking into account only the travel and accommodation costs of funded participants. Table 2 shows the total cost of the meeting.

2. The projections are based on averages of negotiated fare flights to the venues from Africa, the Americas, Asia, and Europe. The accommodation costs uses WHO per diems for the various locations, comparisons with local hotel rates show these per diems are not generous and would just cover anticipated hotel costs. The conference fee is based on quotations received from the various venues, namely, the Arusha International Conference Centre, the Cape Town Convention Centre and the Safari Park Hotel in Nairobi. The Conference Organizer fee is based on quotations received and common practice of charging a percentage fee depending on the size and budget of the conference. The range used is between 15 -18% depending on the anticipated complexity of the requirements. These costings do not include standard items like interpretation which will be much the same for any venue and amount to between US\$ 80,000 – 100,000 depending on availability of interpreters. All the costs would, of course, have to be negotiated.

3. It is strongly recommended that the Resource Mobilization unit at the Global Fund raise funds specifically to cover the costs of the Forum, rather than taking the money from the existing budget. Initial discussions with the fund-raisers suggest this should not be too difficult for a budget in the region of US\$ 1.5 million.

4. It should be noted that if the number of participants rises to 1200 – 1500 the costs will rise accordingly and the meeting will have a global price tag of about US\$ 4.5 to 5 million. Even if the Global Fund bill is only a part of that cost, it will be necessary to justify spending that amount of money on a meeting in the face of the ongoing epidemics.

#### **4. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. It is recommended that the Partnership Forum not exceed a maximum of 900 participants.
2. It is recommended that if the number of participants do not exceed 900, then the preferred location is Arusha, Tanzania. In the event that participation is over 1000, then Cape Town or Nairobi will need to be considered.
3. It is recommended that the Chair of the Board establishes a Steering Committee for the Forum as soon as possible.
4. It is recommended that the Secretariat start the process for contracting a conference organizer for the Forum as soon as possible.

## **Exhibit 1**

### **Relevant extracts from the By-Laws:**

#### **“Article 7**

##### **Composition of the Partnership Forum**

The Partnership Forum is an informal grouping of persons and entities concerned in the prevention, care, treatment and eventual eradication of HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, meeting periodically to express their views on the Foundation's policies and strategies.

Participation in the Forum will be open to a wide range of stakeholders that actively support the Foundation's objectives. Members of the Partnership Forum will include representatives of donors, multilateral development cooperation agencies, developed and developing countries, civil society, NGO and community based organizations, technical and research agencies, and the private sector. The Foundation Board will establish criteria for participation and rules of procedure.

#### **Article 8**

##### **Functions of the Partnership Forum**

The Partnership Forum will:

- Review progress based on reports from the Foundation Board and provide advice to the Foundation on general policies;
- Provide an important and visible platform for debate, advocacy, continued fund raising, and inclusion of new partners;
- Mobilize and sustain high level coordination, political commitment and momentum to achieve the Fund's objectives; and
- Provide a communication channel for those stakeholders who are not formally represented elsewhere in the governance structure.

#### **Article 9**

##### **Operations of the Partnership Forum**

The Forum will meet at least once every two years.

A meeting of the Partnership Forum shall be convened by written notification from or on behalf of the Foundation Board.

The Foundation Board shall establish the rules of procedure governing the meetings of the Partnership Forum”.

**Exhibit 2**  
**Table 1**

Cost Projections for the Global Fund Partnership Forum						
*(calculation based on Funded Participants Travel and Accommodation only)						
Location	ARUSHA, TANZANIA	ARUSHA, TANZANIA	CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA	CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA	NAIROBI, KENYA	NAIROBI, KENYA
Participants	600	750	600	750	600	750
Travel	\$1,350,000	\$1,650,000	\$941,500	\$1,152,500	\$920,000	\$754,000
Accommodation	\$158,000	\$190,000	\$165,900	\$199,500	\$317,580	\$381,900
Conference Fee	\$72,000	\$90,000	\$106,031	\$132,539	\$36,000	\$45,000
Organizer Fee	\$12,960	\$16,200	\$15,905	\$19,881	\$5,400	\$6,750
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$1,592,960.0</b>	<b>\$1,946,200.0</b>	<b>\$1,229,335</b>	<b>\$1,504,419</b>	<b>\$1,278,980</b>	<b>\$1,187,650</b>

**Table 2**

Cost Projections for the Global Fund Partnership Forum						
Location	ARUSHA, TANZANIA	ARUSHA, TANZANIA	CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA	CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA	NAIROBI, KENYA	NAIROBI, KENYA
Participants	600	750	600	750	600	750
Travel	\$2,080,000	\$2,700,000	\$1,466,000	\$1,907,500	\$1,216,000	\$1,555,000
Accommodation	\$240,000	\$300,000	\$252,000	\$315,000	\$482,400	\$603,000
Conference Fee	\$72,000	\$90,000	\$106,031	\$132,539	\$36,000	\$45,000
Organizer Fee	\$12,960	\$16,200	\$15,905	\$19,881	\$6,480	\$8,100
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$2,404,960.0</b>	<b>\$3,106,200.0</b>	<b>\$1,839,935</b>	<b>\$2,374,919</b>	<b>\$1,740,880</b>	<b>\$2,211,100</b>

\* Conference Fee Costs for Nairobi are for a hotel NOT a conference centre (facilities will be limited accordingly); current information is that the Kenyatta International Conference Centre is not available for conferences at the moment and future management of the centre is in dispute

### Exhibit 3

- January 2004: **UNAIDS PCB**
- February 1-5, 2004: **Molecular Approaches to Malaria 2004**  
Erskine House, Lorne, Victoria, Australia
- May 2004: **World Health Assembly**  
Geneva, Switzerland
- June 3-5, 2004: **13th International Symposium on HIV & Emerging Infectious Diseases**  
Toulon, France
- June 6-9, 2004: **7th World Congress on Injury Prevention, Control and Safety Promotion: Inequalities of Injury Risks and Access to Safety Solutions**  
Vienna, Austria
- July 11-16, 2004: **15th International AIDS Conference (IAS)**  
Bangkok, Thailand
- July 11-15, 2004: **28th Congress of the International Society of Blood Transfusion (ISBT)**  
Edinburgh, UK
- July 11-16, 2004: **XV International AIDS Conference**  
Bangkok, Thailand
- July 18-23, 2004: **12th International Congress of Immunology**  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
- 8-13 August, 2004: **17th International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety**  
Glasgow, United Kingdom
- October 17-20, 2004: **6th Annual Combined HSANZ & ASM/ASBT Conference**  
Melbourne, Australia
- Oct 30 - Nov 2, 2004: **44th Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy (ICAAC)**  
Washington DC, USA
- October, 2004: **International Congress of the International Academy of Pathology/AIMS**
- 7-11 November, 2004: **American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene 53rd Annual Meeting**  
Miami, Florida