



# The Global Fund

TO FIGHT AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS  
AND MALARIA:

**Strengthening Civil  
Society Participation  
and Gender Expertise**

■ RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION POINTS ■

*by Dr. Nata Duvvury, Helen Cornman and Carolyn Long*

## “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.”

— RICHARD FEACHEM  
GLOBAL FUND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
JAN. 29, 2003

## “In honoring the Global Fund’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.”

— CIVIL SOCIETY REPRESENTATIVE  
JUNE 2004



# Executive Summary

***Nearly five years ago, the world came together to scale up its response to three devastating diseases by creating the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.***

Known to many as “the Global Fund,” this international institution is unique in that it draws its activities directly from the knowledge and insight of organizations on the

ground and communities affected by the diseases. For the first time, civil society representatives are formally involved in the institution’s decision-making processes. Members of affected communities and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)—from both developed and developing countries—sit on the Global Fund board and participate in country-level partnerships that develop and submit grant proposals, and monitor and implement programs.

Already, this historic endeavor has succeeded in bolstering many countries’ ability to respond to the health care needs of their people. But as with any first, much can be improved. Any effort to increase civil society participation in an international institution as complex, wide-reaching and well funded as the Global Fund faces inherent challenges. For instance, the Global Fund established flexible, national guidelines designed to provide countries room to develop funding proposals that best suit their needs, but in some cases these guidelines have led to confusion and miscommunication about civil society’s role in the monitoring and implementation of projects, potentially frustrating civil society participants. In Kenya, for example, this confusion coupled with additional factors, such as logistical challenges, inadequate human and financial resources, and poor communications, has led to a dramatic decline in the number of proposals being submitted by civil society organizations.

As various civil society organizations and others monitor the Global Fund’s unique governance structure and its effectiveness in achieving its mission—to fight HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria—it is important that these and other lessons be shared so that improvements can be made to strengthen the Global Fund and, more broadly, to promote civil society participation in other international and multilateral organizations.



As a first step, the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) conducted a two-year research and advocacy project—funded by the Ford Foundation—to review the Global Fund’s effectiveness. Specifically, the project examined the inclusion of gender to strengthen decision making, operations and programs, and civil society’s participation in the Global Fund.

The first phase of research focused on the extent to which gender perspectives are integrated into the structure, policies and mechanisms of the Global Fund and its related bodies, such as board committees and the technical review panel. It also reviewed the nature, quality and extent of civil society participation in the Global Fund board and its related bodies. In the second phase, ICRW carried out three case studies. Two case studies examined the role of civil society organizations in the Global Fund’s country coordinating mechanisms (CCMs) in India and Kenya as well as the extent to which gender considerations were taken into account at this level. The third case study analyzed how the Global Fund board dealt with civil society-related issues. Details on the findings from the second research phase are available in the companion report, “Civil Society Participation in Global Governance: Lessons Learned from the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.”

Based on findings from this research, ICRW is recommending key action steps for how the Global Fund can improve its overall effectiveness by building gender expertise into its operations and programs, and strengthening civil society’s role in its decision making and governance. The recommendations and action points contained in this report build on and refine preliminary conclusions that ICRW developed in June 2004. They are intended to guide the Global Fund as it moves forward.

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### **I. More Fully Integrate Gender into Global Fund Operations and Policies**

- The board, country coordinating mechanisms, civil society delegations, and the Global Fund secretariat should increase gender expertise within their bodies.
- Integrate gender analysis throughout Global Fund operations, including policy, planning, monitoring and evaluation.

### **II. Enhance Civil Society’s Role in Global Fund Governance**

- Ensure that board chairs and executive directors sustain the Global Fund’s commitment to enabling meaningful civil society participation.
- Civil society organizations should strive to improve the quality of civil society representation within the Global Fund.
- Strengthen county coordinating mechanism guidelines to facilitate meaningful civil society participation.
- Clarify the role of country coordinating mechanisms in monitoring projects approved by the Global Fund.
- Improve communication between the board and civil society representatives, among civil society representatives and within country coordinating mechanisms.
- Ensure transparency in the process of nominating delegation board members.
- Improve transparency within the country coordinating mechanisms.



# Recommendations

## **I. More Fully Integrate Gender into Global Fund Operations and Policies**

Women comprised 41 percent of adults living with HIV in 1998. Today, nearly half of adults living with HIV are women. The feminization of HIV and AIDS and other diseases has brought to the forefront the crucial need to address broader gender inequities as part of the global effort to mitigate, if not eradicate, these diseases.

The Global Fund has been a leader in its commitment to integrating gender concerns into its structures, policies and processes. But to date, its efforts have fallen short in large part because its focus has been on increasing women's participation in the Global Fund instead of also ensuring that its participants—both men and women—have adequate technical skills in gender analysis. Both strategies are needed to address problems related to gender inequity.

Moving forward, a concerted effort is needed to increase gender expertise within the Global Fund itself, as well as a plan to integrate gender analysis throughout its operations.

### **■ THE BOARD, COUNTRY COORDINATING MECHANISMS, CIVIL SOCIETY DELEGATIONS, AND THE GLOBAL FUND SECRETARIAT SHOULD INCREASE GENDER EXPERTISE WITHIN THEIR BODIES.**

Global Fund management has reviewed the profile of the board, secretariat, technical review panel and country coordinating mechanisms (CCMs) and is making more systematic attempts to ensure that women are represented in all Global Fund bodies. Yet no consideration is given to whether the candidates have gender expertise. Civil society criteria for board members and alternates include a requirement of being “gender sensitive.” However, the level of gender expertise among civil society board members, alternates and communication point people remains limited. While gender balance is a necessary condition to address gender

issues, it is not sufficient to ensure gender concerns are integrated into programs and policies. Gender expertise also is needed.

Both the technical review panel and the CCMs are notably lacking in gender expertise, with many CCMs lacking representation from the Women's Ministry or women's NGOs. For example, the Kenyan case study concluded that most CCM members did not understand gender concepts, and the Joint Interagency Coordination Committee (the CCM in Kenya) made no effort to reach organizations that focused on women. In fact, when the only female civil society representative was asked if she represented women's issues on the committee, she replied, "I am representing the women infected and living with the virus and not women or gender issues." The India case study noted that though the four women CCM members happen to have gender expertise, their appointment is based on their position within their respective organizations rather than their gender expertise.

#### **Action Points:**

---

- **The Global Fund board should review** whether gender balance has resulted in gender issues being better addressed.
- **The Global Fund board should review** gender expertise available within the board, committees of the board, and secretariat of the Global Fund and immediately remedy the gap.
- **At a minimum, CCMs must include** a representative of the national ministry of women/gender and at least one civil society organization that focuses on women.

### **■ INTEGRATE GENDER ANALYSIS THROUGHOUT GLOBAL FUND OPERATIONS, INCLUDING POLICY, PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATION.**

A review of Global Fund documents found that the institution lacks a clear agenda for dealing with key gender issues—a gap reflected throughout all its operations. Consultants themselves, who in 2003 conducted approximately 20 case studies of CCMs for the Global Fund, failed to consider gender beyond improving gender balance in the CCMs' composition. In 2004, the Global Fund assembled a monitoring and evaluation toolkit, which recommends collection of sex-disaggregated data for certain components but does not require it. Not surprisingly, the case-study review found that sex-disaggregated data is not uniformly collected.

In terms of integrating gender considerations in its program content, the Global Fund has included a section in its requests for proposals calling for a discussion of how gender equality would be addressed throughout the proposed program. Most country proposals, however, demonstrate scant evidence of any systematic attempt to address gender issues through program design.

#### **Action Points:**

---

- **The Global Fund board should immediately require** sex-disaggregated indicators for each program activity in country proposals and incorporate gender-responsive indicators as part of: (1) the technical review panel's criteria for proposal review; (2) the Global Fund's Monitoring and Evaluation toolkit; and (3) the plan for overall evaluation of the Global Fund.

- **In its meeting scheduled for December 2005**, the Global Fund board should instruct the policy and strategy committee to draft a gender action plan for presentation at the next board meeting. The action plan should draw on existing civil society gender expertise and include, but not be limited to, the following steps:
  - (1) **ENSURE SUFFICIENT GENDER EXPERTISE** within the technical review panel so that all proposals are reviewed by at least one gender expert before the next round of proposals. The technical review panel 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.
  - (2) **WITHIN THE SECRETARIAT, DEVELOP A TEAM** of portfolio managers to assess whether proposed program activities have a gender neutral, gender sensitive or gender transformative impact on women.
  - (3) **DEVELOP A HANDBOOK** to assist CCMs in integrating gender perspectives into their operations and proposals as well as program development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.
  - (4) **DIRECT THE SECRETARIAT** to facilitate training to develop a gender focus within the CCMs and utilize local gender experts as trainers.
- **The CCMs should include one gender expert** to assist the civil society organizations and the CCMs in mainstreaming gender concerns in proposals and projects.
- **The civil society delegations should include** at least one gender expert on their regular delegations and, in the case of the developed country NGO delegation, include a gender expert as part of the NGO contact group.
- **Donors should provide financial resources** for training civil society representatives on the board and/or CCMs to develop a gender focus and to integrate a gender orientation into existing policies.

## **II. Enhance Civil Society's Role in Global Fund Governance**

Civil society participation in the Global Fund, especially on the board, is consistent, formalized and representative. Civil society is formally involved in all of the Global Fund's operations, from top to bottom. The civil society representatives also are committed to the process and value their role. They come prepared for board meetings, with a clear agenda developed through numerous consultations between board meetings and one just prior to a board meeting. They are effective at moving their particular agenda forward through alliances with other board representatives and by mastering the formal rules of procedure that guide the board meetings.

Despite clear commitment, civil society's role in the governance of the Global Fund can and should be improved. Global Fund leadership could strengthen its commitment to the process, and civil society organizations could improve the quality of their participation.

Along these lines, financial and technological constraints need to be addressed to ensure full participation by representatives from NGOs in poor countries as well as those in affected communities. Finally, various roles and responsibilities with the Global Fund need to be better clarified, and decision making must be more transparent.

■ **ENSURE THAT BOARD CHAIRS AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS SUSTAIN THE GLOBAL FUND'S COMMITMENT TO ENABLING MEANINGFUL CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION.**

The Global Fund's top leadership, including both the executive director and the board chair, has expressed commitment to the participation of civil society representatives. However, the board chair and the secretariat must ensure that this commitment is institutionalized throughout the Global Fund. At present, civil society participation in Global Fund governance is not systematically monitored and evaluated. To rectify this, documentation of best practices of civil society participation at the CCM level is needed.

**Action Points:**

---

- **All new civil society board members** should receive orientation by the secretariat.
- **The board should support** an independent biennial review to measure civil society participation and identify best practices for civil society participation in governance.
- **The civil society liaison within the secretariat** should ensure that national civil society organizations are documenting best practices on civil society involvement in the Global Fund. UNAIDS should be requested to provide technical support and resources to document these best practices through umbrella organizations.

■ **CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD STRIVE TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF CIVIL SOCIETY REPRESENTATION WITHIN THE GLOBAL FUND.**

The ICRW analysis shows that representatives who have prior experience as policy analysts and advocates as well as access to implementing organizations are most effective as members of the board and delegations. Such criteria should be considered when civil society is selecting its representatives.

Moreover, the capacity and experience of current civil society representatives can be improved if they are given opportunities to work together to develop a joint strategy. For example, the civil society delegation retreats held prior to the September 2005 board meeting helped the participants develop a strategic agenda for that meeting. Working in small groups during the retreat and then sharing key recommendations in a plenary session maximized effectiveness. The use of small group work also helped to invigorate delegates and provide informal training for newer delegates. These kinds of meetings should continue to be held to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of civil society delegations.

**Action Points:**

---

- **The terms of reference must include** a requirement that nominees have prior experience and/or skill as policy analysts and advocates and access to implementing organizations.
- **All new delegates should receive information** on how U.N. systems operate as well as training in advocacy strategies necessary to participate in the U.S. system.
- **Civil society should aim** for more consistent membership of board delegations to increase effective participation of all civil society delegations, increase institutional memory and improve coordination prior to each board meeting.



# “Until the civil society organizations can learn

to identify issues and get people of integrity who are at par with the government and donor representatives and can stand up to them, selecting representatives will not make a difference.”

— KENYA CASE STUDY

## ■ STRENGTHEN COUNTRY COORDINATING MECHANISM GUIDELINES TO FACILITATE MEANINGFUL CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION.

Assessments of all country coordinating mechanisms (CCMs) conducted by the POLICY Project of the Futures Group recommend a range of policies and processes to strengthen civil society participation. These include more clearly defining the role and expectations of civil society representatives, particularly *vis-à-vis* their representational role, and developing indicators to monitor civil society participation.

Many civil society organizations contend that the Global Fund needs to make a concerted effort to restructure the entire process of civil society participation at the CCM level. At every stage civil society organizations find the process so demanding that the likelihood of their full involvement becomes remote. For example, the in-country proposal development process is too costly and complicated for many civil society organizations to even consider submitting an application.

### **Action Points:**

---

- **Require all CCMs to develop a set of guidelines** for membership selection including criteria and compositional make-up. Additionally, these guidelines should include a conflict-of-interest statement.
- **The Global Fund should increase its commitment** to offering training materials and training workshops to civil society representatives to increase their effective participation on the CCMs.
- **CCMs should simplify the application process** by supporting the introduction of brief concept papers prior to selection of finalists. These could then be further developed into full-fledged proposals with the help of technical experts.

## ■ INCREASE CIVIL SOCIETY’S FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL RESOURCES.

The civil society delegations should assess the technical and financial resources that developing-country civil society needs to participate fully and equally in Global Fund governance and operations.

Civil society participation in CCMs—particularly grassroots participation—is constrained by a general lack of financial resources. This resource deficit translates into significant inequities between civil society organizations from resource-poor settings and resource-rich settings. 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. The

Kenya case study found that meetings, rather than use of information and communication technology, were a more effective communication mechanism, because most civil society organizations (especially smaller ones) do not have access to modern communication technologies such as the Internet. Even where they do have computers and telephone lines, the cost of telecommunication often is prohibitive.

Financial resources also are needed to support and facilitate increased communication between Global Fund representatives and civil society. Stakeholders such as development NGOs, women's organizations and community-based organizations have inadequate information about the Global Fund. Many organizations are unaware of its existence, and CCMs lack an outreach strategy. Too often, civil society organizations either never learn or learn too late of the Global Fund's call for proposals. Moreover, a lack of resources prevents the organization of national-level meetings to discuss how various civil society organizations could apply for Global Fund resources.

Limited finances also inhibit civil society's ability to strategically select its delegation participants. Consistent membership of board delegations would help ensure continuity in the knowledge of board issues, particularly with regard to lobbying and negotiating during board meetings. Instead of selecting participants based on their strengths, most groups select their representatives based on who has what resources available to them and who can travel.

Finally, resource constraints limit the amount of time that civil society representatives can dedicate to fulfilling their responsibilities as board members and alternates. Board representatives need funding to acquire support staff who can improve the efficiency of their participation. Such support staff would provide institutional memory, research assistance and support to the board representatives, the delegations of the civil society representatives and the communication point person.

At present, civil society representatives on the board need to individually fundraise for their time as well as their delegation's travel needs. Little or no coordination exists between civil society representatives, leading to disjointed and sometimes competitive efforts. Donors also do not coordinate their funding, resulting in a lost opportunity to strengthen effective civil society participation.

### **Action Points:**

---

- **A core group of current and past board representatives** as well as participants of civil society delegations should be formed to develop a concrete resource plan, detailing the specific needs for effective civil society participation on the board and fundraising strategies. A donor could support this effort by funding an initial needs assessment meeting.
- **Donor representatives involved with the Global Fund** should coordinate to support civil society participation to achieve coherence and added value from their funding.
- **The civil society delegations should identify activities** that would facilitate greater participation by civil society organizations. The results of this evaluation should be presented to the private sector delegation, as well as the multilateral and bilateral observers on the board, with the intent of motivating them to provide some of the financial support required.

- **A revolving fund should be established** for use by in-country civil society consortiums and umbrella organizations to strengthen civil society involvement within the CCMs. These funds could help ensure that smaller civil society organizations supporting vulnerable groups, particularly women, have adequate access to the Global Fund.
- **A portion of the funds that have been earmarked** by the Global Fund for proposal development should be used to support national and district-level civil society consultative meetings to discuss how various civil society organizations could apply for Global Fund resources.

## ■ CLARIFY THE ROLE OF COUNTRY COORDINATING MECHANISMS IN MONITORING PROJECTS APPROVED BY THE GLOBAL FUND.

Country coordinating mechanisms (CCMs) lack clarity in their roles at the country level. CCMs are to play a vital role in monitoring how Global Fund monies are implemented in country. But because they are not formal “institutions,” the Global Fund contracts directly with a principal recipient, typically a Ministry of Health or Ministry of Finance, not the CCM itself. These principle recipients in turn report on a project’s progress to the portfolio managers of the Global Fund within the secretariat, not the CCMs.

While the Global Fund guidelines clearly state that the CCM role includes monitoring the implementation of activities and any major changes to implementation within Global Fund-approved programs, confusion exists as to the roles of the CCMs and principal recipients. In particular, the principal recipients are unclear about what and how much information they need to share with the CCMs, and CCMs are unclear about their role in project implementation and monitoring, particularly with respect to the role of CCM civil society participants. These concerns were highlighted in interviews with key stakeholders and found in the three case studies.

### **Action Points:**

---

- **Within all CCMs, a small committee should be formed** that is devoted to reviewing and signing off on all progress reports and updates prior to their distribution to the secretariat. This committee should include at least one civil society member. To avoid conflict of interest, this committee should not include the principal recipient, sub-recipients and representatives in the proposal development.

## ■ IMPROVE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE BOARD AND CIVIL SOCIETY REPRESENTATIVES, AMONG CIVIL SOCIETY REPRESENTATIVES AND WITHIN COUNTRY COORDINATING MECHANISMS.

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 its Web site in a timely fashion. Despite an unprecedented openness to ongoing civil society participation, however, key informants raised a number of concerns, including:

- **board documents**, and in particular the technical review panel report, are not available prior to the board meetings, limiting the ability of civil society to provide input into the board’s final proposal approval;

- **no public disclosure of the scoring form** used by the technical review panel to rate proposals; and
- **difficulty in finding the technical review panel report** on proposals, which is not posted separately on the Web site but included as a part of the board docket.

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 critical gap in communication between board representatives and the broader civil society has limited their effectiveness on the board. The communication gaps are in part due to the overload on the communication point person for the civil society representatives and delegations.

The task given to the communication point people of establishing communication networks and systems, while simultaneously providing support for current board operations, is overwhelming. The communication point people play a critical role in supporting the civil society board representatives, alternates and delegations to build common strategy, lobby and negotiate. They collate input for umbrella organizations for board agenda items, prepare issue sheets and organize pre-board meetings for the civil society delegations.

Ensuring that communication point people have adequate time and technical skills to distribute information and policy decisions in a timely and consistent manner is required for a transparent flow of information from the field/regional level to the board and back to the field.

#### **Action Points:**

---

- **Increase transparency of the proposal-approval process** by disclosing the scoring form used to evaluate proposals and directly posting on the Web the technical review panel report prior to each board meeting.
- **The policy and strategy committee**, in collaboration with civil society delegations, should develop a needs assessment and capacity building plan for the civil society communication point people.
- **Civil society delegations should develop** an external communication strategy and focus on coalition building, particularly through development of a Web site and listserv to provide information and access to technical assistance on Global Fund advocacy issues.
- **CCMs should develop a structure** for in-country civil society consultations and develop a clear communication strategy to inform civil society organizations about the Global Fund. An umbrella organization should be selected and funded to facilitate these meetings.
- **Channels of communication must be established** to strengthen the link between Global Fund headquarters and its country partners. A practical way to achieve this would be to appoint liaisons at both points, such as the civil society representative at the CCM level and the civil society representative to the Global Fund. This channel of communication would be useful for CCMs to submit questions or report on problems, and also for those at the Global Fund to convey information to the country level.



## ■ ENSURE TRANSPARENCY IN THE PROCESS OF NOMINATING DELEGATION BOARD MEMBERS.

The 2005 call for board nominations includes terms of reference that address board functions, mandates, working methods, qualifications, criteria for selection, term length, cessation of appointment and the application process.

However, the terms of reference failed to address the issue of conflict of interest. As a result, there is little control over civil society representatives who may be self-serving in terms of either the selection process or, once selected, in representing issues or priorities in board discussions. Discussions of key informants for this study and on the Partnership Forum listserv flag this gap as an area of concern for some community members, particularly with regard to the selection process in which members of the selection committee have become members of the board delegations or assumed other positions.

### **Action Points:**

---

- **Civil society representatives should include** a conflict-of-interest statement in their terms of reference, particularly related to selection of delegates, alternates and communication point people.

## ■ IMPROVE TRANSPARENCY WITHIN THE COUNTRY COORDINATING MECHANISMS.

Numerous concerns about transparency exist at the country coordinating mechanism (CCM) level. In an attempt to address this concern, a new guideline was adopted requiring transparent processes and broad participation for request and review proposal submissions, and nominations of the principal recipient. A guideline also was adopted requiring a documented and transparent process for the election of civil society organizations.

Despite these advances, the issue of transparency remains paramount for civil society members of the CCMs. In India, the Ministry of Health has been selecting the civil society members even though in 2005 civil society advocated for a selection process based on an electoral-college model. In Kenya, concern was expressed about the ability of civil society representatives on the CCM to fully represent the community.

### **Action Points:**

---

- **CCMs should develop clear principles** on the sharing of funds, budget ceilings for each round of proposals, and proposal selection criteria for principal recipients.
- **Terms of reference should be developed** for all CCM representatives. CCMs may need technical assistance in this area.
- **Terms of reference also should be developed** for principal recipients to include membership and selection criteria for both the principal recipient and sub-level recipient.
- **Management tools should be devised** for principal recipients and CCMs for reviewing proposals and quarterly reports.

# How it works:

## THE GLOBAL FUND TO FIGHT AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS AND MALARIA

The Global Fund was created in January 2002 as a new approach to international health financing that involves civil society at unprecedented levels. Its purpose is to attract and disburse additional resources to poorer countries to prevent and treat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. It does this in partnership with governments, civil society, the private sector and affected communities, and works in close collaboration with other bilateral and multilateral organizations.

The Global Fund relies on local ownership and planning to ensure that new resources are directed to programs on the frontlines of this global effort. It encourages transparency and accountability in its decision making and the actions of all stakeholders to strengthen its coordination and promote innovative partnerships.

An independent organization, the Global Fund with its secretariat based in Geneva is governed by an international board that consists of representatives of donor and recipient governments, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (from both developed and developing countries), the private sector (including businesses and philanthropic foundations) and affected communities.

### Key Global Fund structures include:

- **Country Coordinating Mechanisms (CCMs):** Country-level partnerships that develop and submit national grant proposals to the Global Fund, monitor the proposal's implementation, and coordinate with other donors and domestic programs. CCMs are intended to be multisectoral, involving broad representation from government agencies, NGOs, community- and faith-based organizations, private sector institutions, individuals living with HIV, tuberculosis or malaria, and bilateral and multilateral agencies.
- **Technical Review Panel:** An independent panel of disease-specific and cross-cutting health and development experts who provide a rigorous review of the technical merit of Global Fund applications. They also have expertise on issues related to civil society.
- **Principal Recipient:** A local entity nominated by the CCM and confirmed by the Global Fund to be legally responsible for grant proceeds and implementation in a recipient country. There may be multiple public and/or private recipients in a country.
- **Local Fund Agent:** Independent organizations contracted by the secretariat to assess a principal recipient's capacity to administer funds and provide ongoing oversight and verification of grantee-reported data on financial and programmatic progress.



### **Civil Society's Unique Role**

The integration of civil society perspectives and interests into the design and daily processes of the Global Fund is unprecedented. While other international efforts have involved civil society in advisory roles, The Global Fund requires three civil society representatives—one from a developing-country NGO, a second from a developed-country NGO and a third representing people living with a disease—to sit on the international board; these civil society board members have full voting rights.

Each civil society board member has an alternate and is supported by a delegation of 10 additional civil society representatives. The member chooses these delegation members, whose travel to board meetings is donor-supported. The civil society board member from a developed-country NGO is supported by a larger NGO working group of about 30 members, from which the delegation members are chosen.

The three civil society delegations attend each board meeting and participate in strategy development and advocacy work regarding issues of concern. Each delegation has a communication point person who shares information with civil society constituencies about the meetings and seeks their input on priority topics for consideration by the civil society board members. The civil society board members (or representatives from their delegations) participate as voting members in all Global Fund board committees.

The Global Fund provides transportation to board meetings for the civil society board members, alternates and the communication people. It provides transportation to the board committee meetings for only the civil society board members or his/her designated representative.

The Global Fund's secretariat also attends to civil society interests. It has a civil society liaison whose job it is to communicate and share information regularly with civil society organizations and represent their interests within the secretariat.

# Special thanks to the Project Steering Committee:

**Milton Amayun**

*World Vision International*  
USA

**Susan Chong**

*APCASO*  
Malaysia

**Kieran Daly**

*International  
HIV/AIDS Alliance*  
U.K.

**Milly Katana**

*Health Rights Action Group*  
Uganda

**Lucy Ng'ang'a**

*Eastern Africa Network of AIDS  
Service Organizations*  
Tanzania

**Philippa Lawson**

*The Futures Group*  
USA

**Michele Sumilas**

*Global Health Council*  
USA

**Kate Thomson**

*UNAIDS Secretariat*  
Switzerland

**Anandi Yuravaj**

*International HIV/AIDS Alliance, India*  
India

---

*ICRW also thanks the Ford Foundation for its continued support during this research.*

*The International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) is a private nonprofit organization that conducts policy-oriented research and provides technical assistance on women's work, health, rights and roles in society. It collaborates with other nongovernmental organizations to advance women's economic opportunities and rights. ICRW was founded in 1976 and focuses principally on women in developing and transition countries.*

THE INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON WOMEN  
1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW | Suite 302 | Washington, DC 20036  
tel: 202.797.0007 | fax: 202.797.0020 | email: [info@icrw.org](mailto:info@icrw.org) | [www.icrw.org](http://www.icrw.org)

PHOTO CREDITS:

Cover, Page 1 and Page 13: copyright ©2005 Richard Lord | Page 3: WorldView Images

Copyright ©2005 International Center for Research on Women. All rights reserved.  
Sections of this document may be reproduced without the express permission of but with acknowledgement to the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW).