

COUNTRY COORDINATING MECHANISMS  
SECRETARIAT FUNDING





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	4
<hr/>	
Introduction	5
<hr/>	
Global Fund Policies on Country Coordinating Mechanism Funding	6
<hr/>	
Issues in Secretariat Funding	8
<hr/>	
Conclusions	13
<hr/>	
Recommendations	14
<hr/>	



Since the early rounds of Global Fund grants, Country Coordinating Mechanisms (CCMs) have been operating with support from a combination of financial and technical assistance contributed by government, bilateral and multilateral partners and the private sector. The bulk of this funding has been requested and granted on an ad hoc basis. In 2005, the Global Fund Board codified its direct support to CCMs by authorizing a minimal amount of funding to cover operational costs for a maximum of two years. All three CCMs (**Cambodia, Honduras and Mali**) in this study made use of this approach, with funds being accessed through their Principal Recipients (PRs). At the end of 2007 — after these case studies had been completed — the Board further revised its funding policy, approving the establishment of a separate pool of funds for annual, operational support that can be accessed by any CCM as long as it is overseeing at least one active grant. Going forward, CCMs will no longer be able to draw operational support from grant funds.

The experiences of the three countries reviewed in this study provided several key suggestions for managing CCM secretariat funding.

Each of the CCMs in the study established a secretariat to take on the routine administrative tasks involved in proposal development and grant oversight. Each secretariat has had a uniformly beneficial impact, allowing

the CCM to focus on meeting its key deliverables. Financial support for such a secretariat must therefore be recognized by all partners as an essential element of grant management and implementation.

Clearly costing CCM tasks and levels of effort required to both produce fundable proposals and provide grant oversight would enable CCM secretariats to prepare more accurate and reasonable annual activity plans and budgets. Where the CCM budget was based on a percentage of the total grant, a funding shortfall resulted.

Demonstrating evidence of transparent, accountable management systems would facilitate fund mobilization. Some development partners expressed willingness to assist if such systems were in place.

Establishing a separate account for CCM operational funds would help to avoid bottlenecks in disbursement that occur when funds are routed through government systems.

The CCMs need to be seen as neutral. To avoid perceptions of undue influence by financial supporters, the burden of support for the CCM should be spread among several partners — the Global Fund, development partners, government and local initiatives.

CCMs are responsible for organizing the development of national proposals based upon a gap analysis of funding for national strategic plans to fight HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis (TB), and malaria. CCM members are also responsible for overseeing the implementation of programs. Both of these functions require significant organization of people and resources, including time management. Most CCMs have created secretariats to take on the core administrative functions needed to fulfil the key responsibilities noted above. Depending on the number of grants and the overall size of the country's grant portfolio, CCM secretariats require varying levels of resources to function properly.

CCM support resources were not generally taken into consideration by the Global Fund when it was first established. Rather, it was intended that country partners – in particular bilateral and multilateral development partners – would support the operational activities of the CCMs. While donor partners contributed in different ways, both financially and technically, the financial support needed by the CCM fell short of what was needed to ensure that CCMs could effectively play their intended role. Following its fifth funding round, Global Fund policy was changed to allow CCMs to draw on grant funds for administrative support purposes, but only for a maximum period of two years.

Since the first rounds of funding, countries have adopted a variety of models of management and financial support to facilitate the administration of CCMs mostly by establishing secretariats or sub-committees to provide coordination and administrative support.

### Study Design and Methodology

The case studies sought to elicit models used for funding the operational activities of CCMs. It hoped to learn how these CCMs designed and managed light and lean secretariats to support their CCM's core administrative functions in a timely and reasonable manner.

The case studies were conducted during September and October 2007 in **Cambodia, Honduras** and **Mali**. These countries were selected on the basis of several interrelated but often independent factors, including the size of investment, the existence of a reasonably well functioning CCM and anecdotal reports of good management.

Consultants conducted desk reviews and consulted with key stakeholders in the field. The desk reviews focused on Global Fund guidelines and policy documents pertaining to CCM governance and funding, previous reviews of CCMs, and any country-specific documentation including meeting minutes, reports, etc. During field visits, in-depth one-on-one

interviews and focus group discussions were held with CCM members, grant implementers, Local Fund Agents (LFAs) and other partners in the response to the three diseases.

### Secretariat Funding Policy

The CCM is a multi-stakeholder body responsible for developing proposals based upon national strategic plans and for overseeing the utilization of Global Fund resources. Essentially, the role of the CCM can be summarized as follows:

- Coordinate the submission of national proposals for funding through a participatory, consultative process;
- Select one or more appropriate organizations to act as the PR for the Global Fund grant;
- Monitor the implementation of activities funded by the Global Fund grant and approve major changes in implementation plans where necessary;
- Evaluate the performance of these programs, including the performance of the PR, and submit requests for continued funding; and
- Ensure linkages and consistency between Global Fund assistance and other development and health assistance programs in support of national priorities.

A fundamental principle of CCMs is that all members should be treated as equal partners with full rights to participation, expression and involvement in decision-making in line with their areas of expertise. Another fundamental principle is that decision making must be transparent.

The Global Fund guidelines state that CCMs should "remain of a

manageable size in order to work and discharge responsibilities effectively."<sup>1</sup> However, the CCM should be large enough to represent at least all the sectors affected by the three diseases recommended in the guidelines, if it is to be a truly representative, multi-sectoral partnership. Enabling such a multi-stakeholder body to function in the role outlined above — organizing meetings, distributing information, liaising between partners — requires some, if not considerable, financial input.

When the Global Fund was first established, it was envisaged that the expenses required for CCM functioning would be supported by in-country partners, particularly bilateral and multilateral development partners. Funding for operational costs was not provided by the Global Fund, nor was it originally even permissible to include such costs in the country proposals.

Recognizing that CCM support was not always available or sufficient, the Global Fund Board decided, as of Round 5, to approve the use of grant funds to support the CCM as a temporary measure, i.e., for no more than two years. This funding could be accessed only once; further applications for subsequent grants were not permitted. The costs deemed eligible for such support were as follows:

- Staff salaries (the number of staff supported would be determined by the size of the grant and the number of components);

<sup>1</sup> *Revised Guidelines on the Purpose, Structure and Composition of Country Coordinating Mechanisms and Requirements for Grant Eligibility*, Article 9. Global Fund, 2005.

- Office administrative costs (phone, fax, postage, stationery, photocopying);
- CCM meeting costs, including travel costs for nongovernmental CCM members (up to six meetings per year);
- Communication and information dissemination costs for sharing key information (e.g. calls for proposals, periodic reports of implementation status, minutes of meetings), which may include the costs of establishing and updating of websites or newsletters;
- Facilitation costs associated with constituency consultation and processes to promote stakeholder participation; and
- Translations of key information to promote participation by all stakeholders.<sup>2</sup>

The total amount of funding for each CCM was theoretically determined by the size of the grants and the number of components overseen by the CCM concerned, but in reality most CCMs were capped at regionally based ceilings ranging from an annual low of US\$ 25,000 (West Africa) to US\$ 45,000 (Asia).

The desk review conducted as part of this study found no rationale for the discrepancies. Proposals for Global Fund support were to include a sustainability plan for financial support after the first two years of the grant, and were required to indicate any co-financing or in-kind support from in-country partners.

### Revision of Funding Policy

At its Fifteenth Meeting in April 2007, the Global Fund Board recognized that CCMs needed easier access to funding in order to support effective administrative functioning for the lifetime of any grant. In November 2007, the Board eliminated the two-year CCM funding ceiling and created a separate line item in the Global Fund Secretariat budget so that any funds being made available for this purpose would no longer be received through grant monies.

Under the new funding guidelines, CCMs can apply for support of up to an annual maximum of US\$ 43,000 for eligible administrative costs (which remain as before). Requests may be submitted once a year at any time convenient for the CCM. All CCM members must sign the budget request to ensure that all members, especially civil society members, are cognizant of the resources available for constituency communication efforts. Recipient CCMs will be required to submit annual disbursement and activity reports, which will have to demonstrate how civil society stakeholders have benefited from the funding. As more is learned about this new structure, policies will be revised accordingly.



<sup>2</sup> Ibid. Article 23



### Secretariat Management Systems

The CCMs in each of the three countries have adopted diverse ways to manage their funds. In **Cambodia**, an executive sub-committee appears to play this key role, whereas in **Mali**, the CCM Chair takes on this function. Due in part to the uncertainty of support for operational funds that characterized the early years of the Global Fund, some CCMs have developed differing ways to manage the small amount of support provided to them. None of the CCMs has direct access to funds through a dedicated bank account; expenses are either covered directly by the funding source or disbursed on request.

In **Cambodia**, a 13-member executive committee was formed a few months after the establishment of the CCM. This sub-committee carries out much of the CCM's administrative and coordination work, including the oversight of grant implementation. Initially the executive committee also served as the secretariat. A separate secretariat, comprising a secretariat coordinator and an administrative assistant, was established at a later date but there is still some confusion over how roles and functions are divided between the two bodies. The secretariat was originally hosted by the PR (the Ministry of Health) but is now accommodated in the offices of MEDICAM, an NGO network which is currently a Vice-Chair of the CCM.

In its first years of operation the **Cambodia** secretariat received both direct and indirect support from several development partners. It is currently supported by an allocation from the grant funds, which are channeled through the PR. Neither work plans nor details of expenditures were made available during the case study.

Chaired by the representative for people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA), the CCM in **Honduras** is supported by an executive secretary, who leads a small team comprised of a strategic monitoring officer, a communications officer, an administrative officer and a secretary.

In recent years, the CCM in **Honduras** has obtained support from the Global Fund, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) on the basis of specific proposals and work plans and reported use of funds received. The Honduran Secretariat does not have direct access to the funds. Rather, support from the Global Fund is channeled through the PR (the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)); support from USAID is disbursed through Management Services for Health, an international nonprofit organization managing USAID-funded programs in the country, while UNAIDS contributions come directly from the agency.

In **Mali**, following a restructuring in 2005, the CCM was chaired by the World Health Organization (WHO)

representative. In June 2007, USAID's health division head took over the position of Chair. One of the outcomes of the restructuring process was the development of terms of reference (TORs) and a budget for the CCM, in which provisions were made for the establishment of a permanent secretariat staffed by a permanent secretary, another secretary, and a driver/assistant. Only the permanent secretary position, however, has been filled. The permanent secretary has therefore had to shoulder all the administrative and coordination tasks single-handedly since his appointment in March 2007.

Since 2005, the **Mali** CCM operations have been supported by the Global Fund through allocations from three grant-funded programs. These funds are supplemented by support from other development partners based on specific proposals. Neither the CCM nor the secretariat has any direct control over funds.

It is difficult to draw any conclusions about what has influenced partners to contribute to CCM funding. In **Mali**, the consensus seems to be that the chairmanship held by the multilateral and bilateral partners since 2005 contributed significantly to the effective operation of the CCM. In particular, during his term as Chair (2005–2006), it was the WHO representative who initiated the restructuring of the CCM, was instrumental in establishing the technical mechanisms (budget and TORs) for support for the CCM

secretariat and actively sought to mobilize funding.

In **Honduras**, on the other hand, no particular influence of any one person could be discerned, but it was reported that a poor relationship between the PR and USAID had influenced the CCM's interactions with both institutions. Although there was no indication of whether this had jeopardized the CCM's access to funding, it does highlight the desirability of having either independent sources of funding or funding from multiple sources to "spread the risk" of any one of them being withdrawn.

### Secretariat Tasks and Functions

The CCM secretariat is not a prescribed element within the Global Fund architecture but it is increasingly seen as necessary to coordinate and carry out the considerable amount of administrative work needed to operate a CCM. Generally speaking, the functions of a CCM secretariat include some or all of the following:

- Organizing CCM meetings (and meetings of technical sub-committees): preparing agendas, issuing invitations, preparing and disseminating minutes;
- Maintaining the records of the CCM, including attendance at meetings;
- Making public announcements of calls for proposals;

- Translating (where necessary) and distributing Global Fund documents (including policies and guidelines), proposal drafts and other documentation;
- Facilitating the proposal-writing process;
- Collating and submitting reports and proposals to the Global Fund;
- Serving as the country focal point for the Global Fund: responding to enquiries from the Global Fund and other parties, and liaising with the PR, LFA and Fund Portfolio Manager;
- Organizing oversight activities such as progress reports for CCM review and site visits by CCM members to grant-funded activities.

All the case studies concluded that managing these tasks adequately requires full-time commitment.

### Secretariat Financing

Since 2005, all three countries in this study have taken advantage of the opportunity to draw operational funding from approved grant funds. This funding has been supplemented by contributions from in-country partners, particularly bilateral and multilateral agencies and the Ministry of Health. All the CCMs have received a combination of financial and technical or in-kind support (such as office space and utility fees).

Historically, the largest contributor to the CCM in **Cambodia** outside the Global Fund has been the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische

Zusammenarbeit (GTZ). Between 2004 and 2006, GTZ provided office space, running costs and a consultant for the development of the Round 4 proposal (US\$ 19,150) and provided a further € 8,939 for operational costs in 2004 and 2005.

The Ministry of Health, meanwhile, has seconded an administrative assistant to the secretariat since 2002, and sponsored consultants, workshops and training. In addition, it has provided space and logistical support for meetings. Other development partners (namely UNDP, UNAIDS, WHO and USAID) have contributed technical support for proposal preparation, oversight of the PR and the development of various guidelines and tools for CCM governance, including a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan for the PR and sub-recipients. As noted earlier, office space for the secretariat is currently provided by one of the CCM Vice-Chairs.

Following a capacity needs assessment in 2006, the CCM submitted a proposal to the Global Fund for operating and strengthening its secretariat. The Global Fund approved support for its then-maximum term of two years (June 2006 to June 2008) totalling US\$ 157,000. This funding was drawn from the Global Fund grant and was routed through the PR. It seems that while funding was requested under various budget heads, the CCM does not have a comprehensive work plan or fund utilization plan.

The CCM in **Honduras** has relied on a combination of funding from three sources: the Global Fund, USAID and UNAIDS. The Global Fund approved a total of US\$ 380,000 for two years until April 2008, while USAID allocated US\$ 500,000 per year for two years (until June 2008) for administrative and technical support. UNAIDS has contributed approximately US\$ 10,000. In each case, the CCM developed work plans for the use of such funds, which were then presented at a CCM meeting, before being submitted to the respective donors. Funds are reported regularly and verified through receipts, invoices, etc.

Until 2005, the Ministry of Health (the PR for the malaria component) bore most of the running costs of the CCM in **Mali**. No formal budgets or work plans were supplied: funds were drawn down on an ad hoc basis from the ministry's operational budget. Development partners contributed by funding the cost of consultants for proposal writing.

As part of the **Mali** CCM's restructuring process in 2005, a technical committee drew up a budget based on estimated expenditures and operational costs, including salaries. This budget formed the basis of a request for support to the Global Fund in June 2005. The CCM was funded to cover operating costs (including staff salaries, fuel coupons and office supplies) from its three approved grants. Because this had not been provided for in the original proposals,

each program was forced to adjust its budget to be able to divert funds to the permanent secretariat.

Since the grant funds could not be used for capital expenditures, USAID agreed to equip the permanent secretariat by providing a computer, office equipment, furniture and a vehicle. The Ministry of Health provided an office and covered communication costs and utility bills. Support for proposal preparation was provided by WHO and the French technical cooperation program.

The **Mali** secretariat has experienced some difficulties in accessing funds in a timely manner. This has been largely because the allocations from the grant funds have to be transferred first to the Department of Administration and Finance. Administrative bottlenecks then hinder the process of cash disbursement from the department, which has led to delays in the payment of the Permanent Secretary's salary.

### Planning for Sustainability

Given that the Global Fund originally capped CCM funding at a one-time, two-year request, one would have expected CCMs to have initiated longer-term planning cycles, but this did not appear to happen. Moreover, one of the conditions of approval for the use of grant funds, according to the revised guidelines, was a sustainability plan for support to the CCM after the first two years of grant support. None of the three countries in this study, however, had put any such plans in place.

The **Honduras** case study noted that a sustainability plan for the CCM was under consideration. Conversely, it was also noted that no initiatives had been taken to secure future funding commitments from either local or international sources, whether public or private sector. Moreover, it appears that international development partners are no longer interested in supporting the secretariat. This may be linked to the statement in the report that the majority of the funds allocated from Global Fund grants had been used to support the “constant supervision travels of the executive secretary to San Pedro Sula”, which might raise questions regarding the appropriate use of funds.

While respondents in **Cambodia** recognize the need for a strong secretariat, no sustainability plans have been drawn up to address this need. Although it appears that there has so far been a high level of cooperation and support from bilateral and multilateral partners, the case study gives no indication of whether this can be expected to continue. Remarks made by CCM members to the effect that funding from local stakeholders could compromise the neutrality of the CCM suggest that local fund mobilization would not be a preferred option. It could be inferred here that since local funding most likely means government funding, the fear is that the CCM would be steered toward government priorities at the expense of broader national interests as represented by the civil society and development partner members.

In **Mali** there appeared to have been some misinterpretation of the Global Fund’s guidelines on funding. Despite having been granted access to program funds under the Round 6 malaria grant and the Round 4 Phase 2 HIV and TB grants, the CCM again budgeted for CCM secretariat support in the Round 7 TB proposal, based on the assumption that this was a legitimate component of every grant. On the contrary, this would not have been permissible under the pre-2008 guidelines, which stipulated that support was only available on a once-only basis, for a maximum of two years, and not per grant.

Consultations with the CCM’s financial partners — including USAID, WHO and the French technical cooperation agency— indicated that there was still a high level of goodwill and readiness to continue support for the CCM, albeit in a limited way. One of the agencies concerned noted that this would be contingent upon the CCM establishing a transparent management system for the funds.

The **Mali** CCM is in the process of formulating a long-term work plan and detailed annual budget which will include support for the operating costs and salaries of the permanent secretariat. This will be based on realistic estimates of inputs and costs. In addition, to circumvent the lengthy administrative process of disbursement through the Department of Administration and Finance, the CCM envisages that future secretariat

support funds will be deposited in a dedicated bank account managed by this department, the Ministry of Health or the CCM itself.

While it appears that none of the CCMs in this study have made a concerted effort to address sustainability, the introduction of the Global Fund’s revised CCM funding policy included in the guidelines has removed some of the urgency from this issue. However, the funding available is limited to a maximum of US\$ 43,000 per CCM per year. Given the size of the current CCM budgets presented in the case studies, all of which exceed this amount, it is likely that most CCMs will have to continue to seek supplementary support.

### **Balancing Support and Independence**

There seems to be little doubt that the support of bilateral and multilateral partners has been a critical factor in enabling these CCMs to carry out their functions reasonably effectively. However, in two of the three cases, the Ministry of Health did provide essential support in the form of personnel, office accommodation and supplies, costs of meetings, and so on. In **Mali**, moreover, the CCM was financed almost entirely by the Ministry of Health for its first three years of operation. A key contribution of the international partners appears to have been the provision of financial and technical support to ensure the development of quality proposals, while the later addition of Global Fund

support allowed for the recruitment of professional staff to the CCM secretariats.

All three countries expressed some concern about the CCM's ability to remain independent while receiving support from stakeholders. Respondents in **Cambodia** noted the value of having support from a neutral player such as GTZ, which has no stake in the allocation or use of Global Fund monies. Locally sourced funding from the government, it was felt, could compromise the neutrality of the CCM. The involvement of development partners, on the other hand, did not seem to be perceived as a threat to independence. On the contrary, their support, both financial and in terms of time spent on CCM sub-committees, was seen as crucial. In sharp contrast, the "threat" in **Honduras** was perceived to come from internationally sourced funding. While acknowledging that external funding had enabled the CCM to consolidate its functions and improve its governance, respondents noted that it had not led to empowerment or country ownership. It was felt that the CCM is overly dependent on the Global Fund and that administrative and operating expenses should be covered by national sources, while international cooperation could provide support for technical assistance.

In **Mali** there was no sense that financially contributing partners had intervened in CCM activities in a negative way; rather, they had merely

supplied what was needed when requested, and in so doing had helped the CCM toward the achievement of its goals — the coordination of proposals, selection of PRs, monitoring of grants, etc.

Under its new funding policy, the Global Fund provides up to a maximum of US\$ 43,000 per year. The annual CCM budgets indicated in these case studies were roughly US\$ 695,000 in **Honduras** and the equivalent of US\$ 65,000 in **Mali**, while the Global Fund has approved annual support of US\$ 78,500 for the **Cambodia** CCM.<sup>4</sup> Without verification of these amounts, and without data from other countries, it is difficult to say whether these three cases represent an indicative range of CCM budget requirements, but if they do, the support provided by the Global Fund will not be sufficient to cover the costs of a typical CCM. CCMs will therefore have to continue to seek additional funding from partners, be they local or international.

Bilateral and/or multilateral partner participation has, on balance, contributed to the improvement of management and governance. In general terms, respondents in **Cambodia** and **Mali** cite the positive impact of development partners through both their financial contributions and their involvement in the work of the CCM. However, it appears that because of the ad hoc nature of contributions from partners, there has been little demand for accountability.

In **Mali**, for example, the development partners' contribution toward improving governance was acknowledged, but it was also noted in the case study that the CCM has yet to put in place a "clear and transparent management mechanism". Against this background, the new model of Global Fund support for administrative costs represents an opportunity to raise levels of management and governance by demanding greater responsibility for the use of funds.

<sup>4</sup>In the Honduras case study, total approved funding for the CCM for two years was given as US\$ 1,390,000, (giving an annual budget of US\$ 695,000) while the Mali case study cited an annual operating budget totaling CFA Fr. 26,810,000.00, which is equivalent to approximately US\$ 65,000 at current exchange rates. The Global Fund has approved the use of a total of US\$ 157,000 in grant funds over a two-year period (June 2006–May 2008) for Cambodia.

These case studies were carried out before the Global Fund revised the CCM funding policy. The conclusion reached in all of them was that CCMs need a minimum level of funding that will enable the CCM to manage the development of quality proposals and provide effective oversight of grant implementation. The considerable administrative burden involved in this work means that having some sort of secretarial or administrative support is a necessity rather than an optional extra. Such support allows CCMs to focus on their key deliverables without the pressure of routine administrative tasks. Financial support for such a secretariat must therefore be recognized by all partners as an essential element of grant management and implementation.

One of the keys to securing adequate funding is a realistic, justifiable work plan and budget. The roles, tasks, levels of effort and capacities required for the operation of a secretariat should be clearly articulated and costed. Annual activity plans and budgets can then be formulated and used as the basis for proposals to potential funding sources. Where budgeting was based on a percentage of the total proposed grant (**Mali**), there was a resulting shortfall in funding.

Potential financial partners (including the Global Fund) may be more prepared to contribute funds if CCMs can demonstrate evidence of transparent, accountable management mecha-

nisms for the support they receive; capacity building or the recruitment of appropriately skilled staff may be necessary for this. Establishing a separate account for operational funds that the CCM can draw down from when necessary would help to avoid the delays that frequently occur when funds are routed through government systems.

Having a strong personality at the head of the CCM seems to be an advantage — as demonstrated by the case of **Mali** — but on the basis of these case studies, it is not possible to draw any conclusions regarding the qualities that could influence the level of support. However, strong advocacy skills and the ability to foster good relations among all partners would probably be advantageous, not just for mobilizing funds but for all aspects of the CCM's work.

These case studies offer little evidence that financial partners — be they government sector or bilateral/multilateral agencies — have had much impact on the autonomy of the CCM. However, to function properly, the CCM must be seen by all stakeholders to be neutral. Ideally it would be supported by a source that has no direct interest in the CCM or Global Fund activities in the country, but it seems doubtful that any such source, even if it existed, would be able to cover costs entirely. To avoid any perception of undue influence by one or more of the financial supporters, therefore, it seems to be preferable for the burden of support

to be spread among several partners — Global Fund, development partners, government and local initiatives.

With the introduction of the new policy on CCM funding in November 2007, the Global Fund has taken an important step toward providing a basis for financial certainty for CCMs. Such support should enable them to function more efficiently and effectively, which in turn will promote better grant performance.



This review of the impact of Global Fund support for CCM secretariats produced the following recommendations:

- For effective fund mobilization, CCMs should map all available and potential resources — financial or in-kind — and consider how they can most effectively be matched to the activities or expenditures identified in the work plan.
- The CCM guidelines recommend that CCMs should facilitate the development of a national technical assistance framework for Global Fund-related processes and activities. Such a framework should include capacity building for CCMs and their secretariats, based on identified gaps.
- These studies suggest that it is important for the CCM, and particularly its leadership, to have a very clear understanding of Global Fund principles, policies and processes so that they can act as effective advocates, communicating not only the needs of the CCM but also the long-term benefits and synergies that will be generated by an effectively performing CCM. Greater familiarity with the Global Fund architecture would also help CCM members to ensure that CCM funds are used appropriately and effectively. The Global Fund may need to consider how CCM personnel can be briefed effectively on these issues. CCM members could also benefit from having access to the resource mobilization and sustainability strategies developed by other Global Fund recipient countries.
- Greater engagement of local partners, including the private sector, in the ownership of the CCM would appear to be a necessary condition for mobilizing sustainable sources of support. This point refers back to the issue, raised in the previous point, of the extent to which Global Fund principles are understood and applied by all the CCM constituents. A related point — although this was not touched on in the case studies — is that a more diversified and/or autonomous funding base could potentially encourage the civil society sector to play a more prominent role in the CCM.

There are many individuals responsible for making this report possible, most of whom we can only thank collectively: the interview respondents. We thank all of you for taking the time out of your very busy day to talk with the consultants who conducted these studies. You have provided us with invaluable information on how to improve the functioning of CCMs and the Global Fund is grateful for your input.

The CCM Team would also like to thank the contractors and consultants who worked on this project and drafted the country-specific studies:

### ***Contractors***

TSF West & Central Africa  
IPPF, East Asia and Oceania  
Sanigest International

### ***Consultants***

Bamba Vadro  
Angela Chaudhuri  
Sharon Claesson

A special word of thanks goes to Sally Wellesley for drafting the theme report.

Many Global Fund Secretariat staff provided input to this report, sometimes to a challenging timeline, and they deserve recognition for their significant contributions.

### ***Country Programs***

Fund Portfolio Managers from all the regional units were generous with their time in providing input to the case study methodology, arranging communications and connections between stakeholders, and reviewing many draft reports.

### ***Communications Unit***

Jon Lidén, Cheryl Toksoz and Beatrice Bernescut for their professionalism and patience.

And last but not least, the very significant contributions from the Global Fund CCM Team itself deserve enormous recognition. Bonnet Mkhweli, Marion Gleixner, Caroline McArthur, Diane Crawford and Monica Takyi-Appiah who organized and coordinated the myriad elements of the report from start to finish.

On behalf of the CCM Team, thank you everyone for your contributions to this collection of lessons learned. I hope that the lessons will be reviewed, discussed and used wherever possible and appropriate.

David J. Winters  
CCM Manager

# THE GLOBAL FUND TO FIGHT AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS AND MALARIA

Chemin de Blandonnet 8  
1214 Vernier  
Geneva, Switzerland

+ 41 58 791 1700 (phone)  
+ 41 58 791 1701 (fax)

[www.theglobalfund.org](http://www.theglobalfund.org)  
[info@theglobalfund.org](mailto:info@theglobalfund.org)

## Photo Credits

Cover Cambodia: The Global Fund/John Rae  
Page 4 Cambodia: The Global Fund/John Rae  
Page 7 Cambodia: The Global Fund/John Rae  
Page 8 Honduras: The Global Fund/John Rae  
Page 14 Honduras: The Global Fund/John Rae

ISBN 92-9224-128-1

**Disclaimer:** The views and facts expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the positions of the Global Fund. This report depicts the findings of independent consultants. The Global Fund bears no responsibility for the accuracy of the data or the views represented.

The geographical designations employed in this publication do not represent or imply any opinion or judgment on the part of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria on the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, on its governmental or state authorities, or on the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The mention of specific companies or of certain manufacturers' products does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by the Global Fund in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

Inclusion of persons in photos should not be construed as indicating their health status.

All rights reserved. This document may be freely reviewed, quoted, reproduced or translated, in part or in full, provided the source is acknowledged.

The Global Fund accepts contributions from governments, corporations, foundations and individuals. To contribute, please visit our website or contact the External Relations team at [info@theglobalfund.org](mailto:info@theglobalfund.org). For more information and updates on the status of the Global Fund, visit [www.theglobalfund.org](http://www.theglobalfund.org)