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THE GLOBAL FUND USES THE FOLLOWING DEFINITIONS:

Key populations are groups that face an increased burden and/or vulnerability to at least one of the three diseases due to a combination of biological, socioeconomic, and structural factors combined with lower access to services due to human rights violations, systematic disenfranchisement and criminalization. In addition, all people living with HIV and those who currently have, or have survived, TB fall within this definition. The following groups are considered to be key populations:

**HIV**
- Gay, bisexual and other men who have sex with men
- Transgender people
  - (with a special focus on transgender women)
- People who inject drugs
- Sex workers

**TB**
- Prisoners and incarcerated people
- People living with HIV
- Migrants, refugees and indigenous populations

**Malaria**
- Refugees
- Internally displaced people
- Indigenous populations in malaria-endemic areas

Vulnerable populations are those groups that do not meet the criteria above but who experience a greater vulnerability and greater impact of the three diseases. These may include those whose situations or contexts make them especially vulnerable, or who experience inequality, prejudice, marginalization and limits on social, cultural and other rights. Examples include:

- Orphans
- Street children
- People living in extreme poverty
- People with disabilities
- Mobile workers
- Girls
- Pregnant women

In the context of this report, the term “key populations” is understood to mean all of the groups mentioned above. The Global Fund recognizes that key populations are central to the fight against HIV, TB and malaria.
Introduction

The Global Fund is rolling out a new approach to funding programs. The goal is to ensure efforts to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria have the greatest possible impact. This updated approach is known as the “new funding model.” You can get more background information about the new funding model at: http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/fundingmodel

One feature of the new funding model is expanded space for the meaningful involvement of civil society, communities and key populations in designing, monitoring and implementing programs that affect their lives.

Civil society organizations, communities and key populations can take action now to make sure they play an active role in shaping funding requests to the Global Fund. This short guide provides advice on how civil society organizations, communities, and key populations can get involved in the process.
Understanding the new funding model

This diagram depicts the key elements of the new funding model process. The purpose of this document is to summarize the new funding model and discuss how, when and where civil society can and should engage in this process. Detailed information about the new funding model is available on the website.

In the past, the Global Fund launched requests for proposals, with submission deadlines generally a year apart. One of the main shifts in the new funding model is to provide several funding application review “windows” each year, so that applicants can submit funding requests at a time that is most convenient to them, and that fits in with their other planning and funding schedules.

As a first step, countries are encouraged to cost the full unmet needs for prevention, treatment, care and support – known as a “full expression of demand”.

Each country will receive an indication of the amount of funding they are eligible to receive from the Global Fund. This amount is for all three diseases (if applicable) and health systems strengthening. Countries must then agree on how this funding will be split between each disease and health systems strengthening. Countries are also encouraged to be bold and to apply for additional funding beyond that amount, so countries have an incentive to be ambitious in what they apply for.

The Global Fund will provide ongoing support and feedback to applicants to help them increase the likelihood of programs having high impact.

Another important change, designed to increase the impact of programs, is that the new funding model aims to ensure that all stakeholders – particularly those from civil society organizations and those representing key populations – are meaningfully involved throughout the funding application process and through grant implementation.

The Country Coordinating Mechanism is still the main body involved in developing proposals and overseeing grants at the country level, but the new funding model recognizes that meaningful involvement requires engaging with actors beyond the Country Coordinating Mechanism through an ongoing country dialogue.

COUNTRY DIALOGUE

The country dialogue is the term used to refer to the ongoing process that occurs at the country level to develop strategies to fight AIDS, TB and malaria and to strengthen health and community systems. It is not a set, defined process, or a Global Fund-specific process. Rather, it describes a range of consultative processes including national strategic planning, mid-term, and program reviews. It includes consultations that are specific to developing funding requests to the Global Fund that reflects the full unmet needs for prevention, treatment, care and support.

The Global Fund expects country funding proposals to be based on a broad, open and transparent process at the national level that is inclusive of ministries of health, finance and planning; the private sector; the public sector; faith-based organizations; civil society; human rights experts; networks of key populations as well as women’s organizations; people who are most vulnerable to and affected by the three diseases; and other technical and financial partners – including the Global Fund. The Global Fund believes that strong engagement of civil society organizations, in particular key populations, gender equality and women’s rights organizations, human rights organizations, and community-based organizations – is essential to an effective consultative process.

Country Coordinating Mechanisms are required to draw on this broader country dialogue process to inform the development of funding requests to the Global Fund. The country dialogue serves to provide groups that are excluded from the Country Coordinating Mechanism or that have weak representation the opportunity to participate meaningfully and provide input to the funding request. It also provides the opportunity to discuss and address barriers to accessing health services.

As such, the country dialogue approach is relevant to all aspects of Global Fund grants, from discussing national priorities, through the development and negotiation of funding requests, to grant implementation and oversight.

For more information on the country dialogue, see the Global Fund website: http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/fundingmodel/process/
Another important element of the new funding model is that the Global Fund will base its support on concept notes building on disease-specific national strategic plans that are robust, prioritized and costed. To serve as the basis for funding, the Global Fund expects national strategic plans and the national health strategy to be developed through inclusive, multistakeholder efforts (involving key populations), and be aligned with international norms and guidance. They should also be built on a clear understanding of the national epidemic based on epidemiological data disaggregated by age and sex, with specific analysis related to human rights, gender and key populations, and other barriers that affect access to health services.

The Global Fund recognizes that not all national strategic plans are robust according to these criteria, and that this should not be a barrier to accessing urgently needed funding. In such cases, applicants may conduct a review process at the country level to strengthen their national strategic plan so that it provides an acceptable basis for a funding application. Alternatively, in cases where a country does not have a strong national strategic plan for AIDS, an “HIV investment case” can be developed with the assistance of the United Nations Programme for HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) to support a Global Fund application. For malaria and TB, countries can ask partners to help them develop a full expression of prioritized demand (i.e. similar to an HIV investment case) in situations where the national strategic plan is exceptionally weak. Efforts to review and update national strategic plans are part of the country dialogue process – indeed, countries do not necessarily have to wait for the normal national strategic plan review cycle before requesting Global Fund funding. Technical weaknesses can and should be corrected during the country dialogue process, so that countries can access funding when they need it, rather than waiting.

Technical support and assistance is available from various donor agencies to either strengthen national strategic plans or to conduct the analysis needed for developing a strong concept note. In addition, the Global Fund will allow countries to reprogram up to US$150,000 of funds from existing grants to support this work, if it is requested by the Country Coordinating Mechanism.

The emphasis on supporting applications based on robust national strategic plans is an important opportunity for civil society and key populations, since one of the main criteria of robustness is that these groups should have been meaningfully involved in the development or review of national strategic plans. The intention is that over time the national strategic plan development process will become increasingly inclusive.

---

1 Please refer to the Global Fund Information Note: Strategic Investments for HIV programs for more information: http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/fundingmodel/support/infonotes/
CONCEPT NOTE

Under the new funding model, funding requests to the Global Fund are submitted in the form of a concept note. Concept notes are less detailed than the proposals that were submitted under the previous system. Under the new funding model, the detailed aspects of the grant (called “grant-making”) are developed once concept notes have been reviewed (the review process, and the grant-making step, are described below). The Country Coordinating Mechanism is responsible for developing and submitting concept notes, based on the outcomes of the dialogue process. The Global Fund will only accept one concept note from each country for each eligible disease or for health systems strengthening in the 2014 to 2016 period, so it is important not to miss the window for engagement. As in the past, Country Coordinating Mechanisms must fulfill certain requirements2 to be eligible to submit a concept note, one of which is an open and inclusive concept note development process (Eligibility Requirement #1), and another of which is that the engagement of key populations on Country Coordinating Mechanisms must be strengthened (Eligibility Requirement #4). These requirements have recently been updated, and more information is available here: http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/ccm/

CONCEPT NOTES CONTAIN FOUR SECTIONS:

Section 1:
Country Context. An analysis of the current disease context in the country, which pays particular attention to health and community system constraints and to human rights and gender barriers to accessing health services.

Section 2:
Funding Landscape, Additionality, Sustainability. A description of current and anticipated funding for the national program over the proposed grant duration. This enables the reviewers to understand current and future commitments towards the disease(s), assess compliance with counterpart financing requirements, and determine the funding gaps of the national program. “Additionality” refers to the principle that Global Fund funding would add to, rather than replace, other funding sources.

Section 3:
Funding Request. Building on the analysis provided, the applicant prioritizes funding needs to the Global Fund.

Section 4:
Implementation Arrangements and Risk Assessment. After defining the interventions included in the proposed funding request, the applicant must identify and describe the main organizations involved in implementing and overseeing the grant.

The concept note template and further detailed guidance can be found on the application material page: http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/fundingmodel/single/applicationmaterial/

Concept notes should be drafted based on robust national strategic plans and on inclusive country dialogues. Even after they are submitted, it is important that civil society and key populations continue to engage in the process of finalizing concept notes and grant-making, through the key populations and civil society representatives on the Country Coordinating Mechanism.

---

2 A complete description of the Country Coordinating Mechanism eligibility requirements can be found here: http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/ccm/guidelines/
**FINAL FUNDING**

Once the concept note is submitted, the Technical Review Panel – a group of independent experts – evaluates the quality and technical soundness of the concept note. If the Technical Review Panel is satisfied with the quality of the concept note, it makes a funding recommendation to the Grant Approvals Committee. However, the Technical Review Panel can also decide that a concept note is not yet ready. For example, it can provide feedback to the Country Coordinating Mechanism and request that they submit a revised concept note.

The Grant Approvals Committee is a committee of senior Global Fund managers together with representatives of technical partners, including communities. Based on the recommendation of the Technical Review Panel, the Grant Approvals Committee decides on a final level of funding for the concept note, which then becomes the basis for grant-making.

There will be nine submission opportunities during the period 2014-2016. Details can be found here: [http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/fundingmodel/single/dates/](http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/fundingmodel/single/dates/)

**GRANT-MAKING**

Grant making is the process of transforming concept notes reviewed by the Technical Review Panel and the Grant Approvals Committee into a grant agreement, which is used as the basis for disbursements. The Global Fund Secretariat works with the organizations selected by the Country Coordinating Mechanism to manage the grants (known as Principal Recipients) to develop a performance framework, a budget, and a workplan.

The country dialogue process is also an important part of grant-making, so as to ensure that input from those who will benefit from the programs is taken into account in their detailed design and that the latest technical and operational guidance is used. Civil society and key population involvement is therefore also an important part of grant-making and these representatives can become involved in a number of ways: as Principal Recipients or sub-recipients (if selected to play this role), as members of the Country Coordinating Mechanism, and as participants in the broader country dialogue.

**FINAL GRANT APPROVAL AND IMPLEMENTATION**

Grant agreements developed through the grant-making process undergo a final review by the Grant Approvals Committee before being approved by the Global Fund Board and the first grant disbursement is made. The Global Fund anticipates that the length of time between the start of funding request development and first disbursement will be reduced considerably under the new funding model. Although the duration will vary considerably in each country, it is expected that on average it will take 10-12 months from concept note development to Board approval.

As grants begin to be implemented, civil society organizations – including organizations focused on gender equality and key populations – should continue to be engaged, as implementers (for instance as Principal or as sub-recipients), or as stakeholders involved in overseeing the grant (this is done through the Country Coordinating Mechanism and the ongoing country dialogue).

**SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY, RIGHTS AND GENDER-RELATED PROGRAMMING IN THE NEW FUNDING MODEL**

Under the new funding model, the Global Fund pays close attention to ensuring all people have access to quality health services that are free from discrimination. That includes support for:

- Strengthening community systems in order to monitor programs, mobilize the community sector, and advocate for change;
- Supporting the response to the three diseases by delivering health services outside of the formal health sector, and providing the necessary institutional capacity building to community sector organizations to enable them to fulfill this role;
- Legal environment assessment, law reform, legal aid services and human rights training for communities, officials, police and health workers;
- Human rights monitoring and advocacy; and
- Efforts to address barriers that increase the vulnerability of women in all their diversity – especially young women and girls – and/or that limit their access to health and related services.

These programming components were designed to ensure the particular concerns of civil society organizations and key populations are taken into account in funding requests under the new funding model. You can learn more about support for these key efforts by reading the Global Fund’s "Guidance and Information Notes" titled *Addressing Women, Girls, and Gender Equality; Community Systems Strengthening; Harm Reduction; Addressing Sex Work, Men Who Have Sex with Men and Transgender People; and Human Rights*. Information notes on each of the three diseases and on health systems strengthening, available on the same web page, also contain information about how to incorporate community, rights and gender concerns.

How should civil society engage with the country dialogue?

ACT NOW: GET A HEAD START ON THE COUNTRY DIALOGUE

As the description of the new funding model above shows, the Global Fund believes that civil society – especially key population representatives and organizations – must play a substantial role in making sure the new funding model delivers results for communities impacted by AIDS, TB or malaria. The new funding model highlights particular ways in which civil society leaders and other advocates can participate in the different elements of the grant development process and fulfill the requirement that their countries develop these requests through an inclusive, robust and transparent process. Civil society organizations can act now to engage in, inform and shape the country dialogue. Civil society should be proactive by kick-starting civil society caucusing that must provide important input into the overall process.

One way to do this is to organize an inclusive caucusing process among civil society, human rights, gender equality and key population actors to identify unmet needs in their communities, priorities and principles for the country application, and then report the recommendations formally to the Country Coordinating Mechanism and other stakeholders and into the overall country dialogue. Representatives of civil society who are officially part of the Country Coordinating Mechanism should be engaged in this effort.

It is especially important to reach out to and ensure direct representation of key populations, since they are often excluded from formal or government-led processes, including Country Coordinating Mechanism-led processes. Key populations which are typically excluded in this way include gay men and other men who have sex with men, transgender women, sex workers and people who inject drugs, as well as people affected by the diseases. There are also other groups often excluded from or poorly represented in national processes such as young people, women and girls, people with disabilities, indigenous people, prisoners and migrant populations. In countries where these groups are criminalized, discriminated against or marginalized, a civil society-led process such as the one described here can be an important and safe way of ensuring their voices and priorities are eventually heard in the Country Coordinating Mechanism and reflected in the concept note.
**AIMS AND PRINCIPLES FOR CIVIL SOCIETY CAUCUSING**

Civil society caucusing should involve people from all regions and constituencies – including key populations and people living with and affected by HIV, TB and malaria – meeting to identify unmet needs in their communities, and the funding priorities required to meet these needs.

The process needs to be inclusive, open and transparent. Funding priorities need to be determined based on the most up-to-date epidemiological data. The process should also identify evidence-based interventions to respond to the diseases, including actions to tackle human rights barriers to accessing services that have been identified, and the importance of gender-sensitive and gender-transformative programming approaches.

Caucusing should also consider actions aimed at promoting the development of informed, capable and coordinated communities, community-based organizations, groups, networks and structures in order to enable them to contribute to effective, sustainable and accountable health programs, including the development of an enabling and responsive environment.

**PRACTICAL TIPS FOR A SUCCESSFUL, INCLUSIVE PROCESS**

1. **Inform the Country Coordinating Mechanism of intention to organize civil society’s contribution to the country dialogue, with the involvement of a diverse and strong coalition of civil society organizations.**

   - Ideally members of civil society who are already part of the Country Coordinating Mechanism should lead this step. This can be done with a written letter that describes the process and demonstrates strong support from a wide range of civil society organizations by, for example, including the signatures of these organizations.
   - Be sure the letter clearly states that this is not a competing or parallel process: instead, explain that the gathering will provide quality, evidence-based recommendations from civil society that will feed into the country dialogue process.
   - Pay particular attention to planning for how “under-consulted” groups and key populations will be included meaningfully from the beginning. Within these groups, there may be additional people who are under-consulted, such as young people from key populations and other marginalized groups. This might also include women and men living with HIV if there are no representatives on the Country Coordinating Mechanism.
   - Consider using the Internet or social media to work with communities who may not be able to travel easily to meetings.
   - Be sure to address the needs of specific communities to allow for their participation. For example, ensure people who use drugs can access methadone; ensure there are medical services available in case a meeting participant has a health emergency; ensure there is funding to support travel for representatives who live outside of the meeting location; ensure the translation of key documents in local languages; organize a pre-meeting for young people participating for the first time in a Global Fund process.
   - Ensure civil society organizations involved in all three diseases are involved. Most importantly, ensure planning for these first meetings includes direct representation of people living with the diseases, as well as key populations and gender and human rights champions.

2. **Convene a planning team of diverse, committed members of civil society and organize an initial consultation**

   This planning team will lead efforts to map out the dialogue process, which starts with an inclusive national meeting. Team members should: help get funding for the process; organize the invitation list; compile the agenda; and find facilitators and presenters. They should also gather background materials needed to have a meaningful discussion about the status of the response to the relevant diseases as well as weaknesses in health and community systems that are limiting the response. These materials will provide the evidence used to support discussions about the national priorities that the civil society dialogue will recommend. A sample agenda for this initial meeting can be found at the end this document.

   The planning team should also address questions specific to the country. Should there be one national civil society dialogue addressing all the diseases followed by separate meetings for each disease? Or, should there be separate processes for each disease? If the latter, the team should also consider a process for discussing the role of civil society in developing the national health systems strengthening concept note, since health systems strengthening programs also include important opportunities for addressing community, rights and gender concerns. Keep in mind that not all diseases are eligible for funding in every country, and also that countries may not decide or need to apply for funding for all three diseases at the same time, since this will have an impact on how civil society dialogues for the three diseases should be organized.

   Ensure planning for these first meetings includes direct representation of key populations, including people living with HIV and those affected by TB and malaria. Take into consideration geographic and language barriers as well as gender balance. Groups with a lack of health services – for instance those in underserved regions or informal settlements – should be represented. Include space in the dialogue for identifying human rights and gender-related barriers that make it difficult for people to access health services.

   In many cases, Country Coordinating Mechanisms will have to make hard decisions about how to use limited funds to achieve the greatest possible impact. Civil society and key populations are important partners in helping Country Coordinating Mechanisms to prioritize programs within the limited resources available. At the same time, it is important to remember that countries should submit a full expression of their demands or needs to the Global Fund rather than only requesting the amount specified in their country allocation. This is because, on the one hand, strong expressions of demand may qualify for additional “incentive” funding; and on the other hand because any interventions not included in the country’s basic allocation request but included in the full expression of demand may
be reprioritized by the Technical Review Panel or the Grant Approvals Committee to become a core part of the grant. In other words, the full demand will be considered at the review stage, not just the amount that the Country Coordinating Mechanism has prioritized for its core request.

3 Organize follow-up consultations

After a first gathering, follow-up teams will need to get together to address the priorities agreed by the larger group. More meetings could be organized by disease (if relevant), by constituency, by area where services are delivered and/or by cross-cutting theme such as program quality or gender equality, or by population group. These follow-up consultations can enable civil society to develop more specific recommendations in relation to these sub-themes.

Members of some communities may be more comfortable speaking in smaller and less visible groups. In order to engage criminalized populations it will be necessary to establish safe spaces to ensure confidentiality and to avoid any possible danger to participants.

4 Discuss national strategic plans

One important topic for civil society to discuss in the dialogue is the current status of the national strategic plans for the relevant diseases and for health systems strengthening. Keeping in mind that the Global Fund aims to support funding applications that are based on robust national strategies to the extent possible, civil society should discuss whether the current plans fulfill the criteria:

- Up-to-date: based on the latest epidemiological information and knowledge about the adequacy of the current response including human rights barriers
- Based on an inclusive, multistakeholder process
- Effectively prioritized and costed
- Based on evidence-based approaches and international norms
- Addresses gender norms and dynamics that exist and that place certain groups at particular risk.

If the national strategic plans are not robust according to these principles, civil society should discuss measures to be taken. If the national strategic plan is due to be reviewed or revised soon, it may be appropriate to engage in this review process and to use it as a basis for a Global Fund application. If, on the other hand, submitting a funding request to the Global Fund is urgent, civil society should consider ways of encouraging the updating of the national strategic plan or developing an “investment case” for the diseases that is robust according to the Global Fund’s criteria. The outcome of this discussion should form part of civil society’s recommendations to the Country Coordinating Mechanism. If it is decided that the national strategic plan should be revised or updated, or that an investment case should be developed, civil society should aim to engage in these processes on the same terms as it engages in the country dialogue. It is also important that civil society organizations document the process and inform partners such as the Global Fund about how inclusive (and therefore how robust) it was. Technical partners at the national level (including UNAIDS and the World Health Organization (WHO)) can be important partners in this process, as they work with national authorities in the development of investment cases and the review of national strategic plans. They can and should play an important role in brokering the inclusion of civil society and key populations in these processes.

5 Ensure each step of the process is documented, open, inclusive and transparent

The civil society caucusing process – just like the broader country dialogue it is a part of – should be open, inclusive and transparent. One way to demonstrate this is to ensure all consultations and meetings – whether they are in-person meetings, or telephone conferences, or online discussions – are documented. This includes noting the list of invitees and attendees, and documenting the topics discussed, the decisions reached and any points of contention. Documentation of the process should be made openly available – for instance through online platforms.

Consider the value of inviting non-civil society members for some parts of the meeting as observers, or to support facilitation and mediation. This could be national policy-makers, donors, donor partners, representatives of regional networks or regional human rights experts, technical partners and/or Country Coordinating Mechanism members who do not represent civil society (in particular, the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Country Coordinating Mechanism). Their participation can also ensure the openness of the process and can be used to increase the legitimacy of the dialogue process results. Care should be taken at all times to ensure that the dialogue space remains safe for people from criminalized or stigmatized populations, however.

6 As well as discussing priorities, discuss implementation arrangements

The organizations selected as implementers of Global Fund grants – Principal Recipients and sub-recipients – have a major bearing on how the grants are implemented. Implementers must have the organizational capacity to manage and distribute funds, but it is also particularly important that they are able to work effectively with communities and key populations. Where key populations are marginalized and criminalized it is even more important that implementers are able to operate in this environment.

Ultimately, the decision on implementation arrangements resides with the Country Coordinating Mechanism and has to be agreed by the Global Fund. However, civil society should discuss criteria to be applied in the selection of implementers and provide input on the implementers under consideration. They should also discuss the roles that civil society organizations can most effectively play in implementation, as well as identifying possible candidates from within civil society that the Country Coordinating Mechanism and the Global Fund should consider.

7 Strengthen internal governance systems among civil society as part of the process

In order to maximize its engagement, civil society needs strong systems in place to continually give feedback, guidance and information to the Country Coordinating Mechanism. Civil
society should embrace the principle of holding inclusive meetings as the hallmark of the country dialogue process. For example, civil society could develop a “terms of reference” for any individuals who are tasked with representing civil society – whether as convenors of the dialogue process, as Country Coordinating Mechanism members, as participants in the revision of the national strategic plan or investment case development processes, or as members of the team who will be responsible for drafting the country concept note. These terms of reference could be based on the priorities set through the dialogue process. It is also wise to discuss early on (and frankly) how any grants that may be awarded to civil society organizations acting as Principal or sub-recipients will be managed and how funding will be distributed to community sector organizations in a way that is transparent and that responds to the priorities of the national response and maximizes the particular contributions different types of organizations bring.

Use resources from the Global Fund and other partners to support a successful country dialogue

The Global Fund Secretariat is developing fact sheets, presentations and other resources about the new funding model. The Secretariat can also provide the latest information about technical assistance and possible funding opportunities available to support civil society’s involvement in the country dialogue. The Global Fund Secretariat staff can address technical questions that might arise at any time.

The Global Fund may also be able to provide some technical assistance or financial support to civil society dialogue processes.

Country Coordinating Mechanisms can receive funding for engagement with constituencies (including civil society) as well as for the translation of documents into local languages as needed. More information on this is available from each Country Coordinating Mechanism and from the relevant Fund Portfolio Manager. Country Coordinating Mechanism funding can also be used to support country dialogue activities.

Partners such as UNAIDS, Roll Back Malaria and Stop TB, are also potential sources of financial and technical assistance for civil society dialogues related to the Global Fund.

Many resources and tools exist to support civil society organizing and caucusing, with a particular focus on open and inclusive processes. These include:

- UNAIDS, the PACT and The Global Fund, Making the Money Work for Young People: A participation tool for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria, 2014 (forthcoming)
- UNAIDS, Gender Assessment Tool, 2014 (forthcoming)

---

4 The point of contact at the Global Fund is the Fund Portfolio Manager. To find contact details for the relevant Fund Portfolio Manager, select the “Grant Portfolio” tab at the top of the Global Fund home page, then select the desired country from the drop-down menu. On the right hand side of the country page is the name of the Fund Portfolio Manager along with contact details.
Work with your Country Coordinating Mechanism representatives to prepare and submit a formal document

The priorities emerging from civil society’s inclusive dialogue process should be consolidated into a formal set of recommendations to be submitted to the Country Coordinating Mechanism. As well as detailing the recommendations (including any recommendations with regard to the quality of national strategic plans), the document should describe the process by which the recommendations were developed, and should enumerate all organizations – including informal community groups – endorsing the document, while taking care not to identify any individuals or organizations whose safety might be jeopardized.

The document should include recommendations relating to:

- Priorities for the concept note, in terms of populations to be reached and programs to be considered
- Implementation arrangements, including the role of civil society in implementation
- Civil society/key population participation in the development of the concept note

The paper should be submitted and presented formally to the Country Coordinating Mechanism for discussion by members, and ideally a formal ratification of the recommendations by the Country Coordinating Mechanism should be sought.

To achieve this, it may be helpful to discuss the recommendations with individual Country Coordinating Mechanism members in advance to ensure that they understand the process and recommendations in order to offer their support. In some countries that were early participants in the new funding model, civil society reviewed the list of Country Coordinating Mechanism members and assigned people to speak to key members about the civil society proposal.

Advocate for increased government investment in AIDS, TB, malaria and health systems

As part of the new funding model, 15 percent of the country’s allocated funding can only be accessed if the government increases its contribution to the three diseases or associated health systems strengthening activities. Governments will be asked to provide evidence on an annual basis that they have met their commitments. Funding from the Global Fund may be adjusted downwards proportionately if a government fails to meet these commitments. Civil society can play a key role in encouraging the government to commit more resources and to deliver on these commitments.

The complete list of Country Coordinating Mechanism members, with full contact details, is available on the country page. Simply go to the Global Fund home page, select the “Grant Portfolio” tab at the top of the page and then select the desired country from the drop-down menu. The Country Coordinating Mechanism page will show the list of members, together with the sector they represent and their complete contact details.
How should civil society engage in concept note development and grant-making?

**PRINCIPLES FOR INVOLVEMENT IN CONCEPT NOTE DEVELOPMENT**

The principles for civil society involvement in concept note development are the same as those for civil society dialogue described above. The process should, above all, be inclusive, open and transparent. However there is an important difference, since concept note development itself is likely to be led by a smaller team focused on the task. Civil society organizations involved in this have a responsibility to express the priorities identified through the civil society dialogue.

**PRACTICAL TIPS TO ENSURE INCLUSION**

1. **Request that members of the drafting team be chosen based not only on their writing skills, but also on their expertise in priority areas and track record in effective representation of the views of constituents.**
   
The part of the Country Coordinating Mechanism in charge of writing the note is often called a “drafting team” or “writing team.” Members of the drafting team should be selected based on their technical expertise, merit and track record of effective discussion rather than by relationships or personality, and should also and a balanced representation of women and men should be ensured.

   Civil society representatives on the Country Coordinating Mechanism should agree with the Country Coordinating Mechanism that civil society is nominating members of the drafting team based on terms of reference developed during the civil society dialogue, and should discuss the appropriate number of civil society participants on the drafting team. When working to ensure civil society inclusion on the drafting team, civil society can highlight the numerous technical priorities identified through the dialogue process. If necessary, seek support from credible partners like donors, technical partners or the government.

2. **Do not do it alone**
   
   In many countries civil society has had multiple representatives on the drafting team. Teamwork and partnership makes the technical and advocacy work of participating in the drafting process easier.

   The size and composition of the drafting team is at the discretion of the Country Coordinating Mechanism. Civil society members should agree in advance with the Country Coordinating Mechanism the appropriate number of civil society participants for each concept note that will be developed. During the concept note development process, civil society representatives can and should continue to consult with the broader civil society constituency, particularly in relation to issues that meet with disagreement in the drafting team. This ongoing consultation with the constituency should be part of the terms of reference of team members.

3. **Request assistance**
   
   Experts in different areas are available to provide technical assistance to different groups, including civil society. Some of these resources are described earlier under Point 8.

4. **Be prepared, and rely on Global Fund resources and other sources to support civil society positions**
   
   The basis for civil society input into the concept note should be the recommendations developed through the civil society dialogue and should be based on sound evidence whenever possible. However, civil society representatives should also draw on other sources of evidence and support. These can include the national strategic plans, international norms, and of course the Global Fund’s own guidance on programming – particularly the guidance relating to community systems strengthening, human rights and the removal of legal barriers, key populations, and gender equality. These information notes, as well as the information notes on each disease and on health systems strengthening, describe the modules and interventions that the Global Fund is prepared to support, and the rationale for including them. Civil society representatives on the drafting team should familiarize themselves with these modules and rationales since they will form the basis of the concept note, and will enable civil society to propose activities that will remove barriers to service access, particularly in relation to programming areas that some Country Coordinating Mechanisms consider controversial. The information notes are available here: http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/fundingmodel/support/infonotes/

If, after having followed all the steps above, you find that you are still unable to engage meaningfully in Global Fund processes, please bring it to the attention of the Fund Portfolio Manager for the country or to the attention of the Community, Rights, Gender team of the Global Fund Secretariat, who can be reached at CivilSocietyHub@theglobalfund.org

**INVolvEMENt IN GRANT-MAKING**

As the description of the new funding model above suggests, concept notes represent a broad, strategic description of national priorities and an overall funding request. Once the concept note has been approved, the Global Fund Secretariat works with the Country Coordinating Mechanism and the nominated Principal Recipients to turn the note into a grant agreement, which then forms the basis for funding.
disbursements. As with all the other steps, the Global Fund sees a role for a broader country dialogue in the grant-making process. Civil society can and should continue to engage with the Global Fund Secretariat and the Principal Recipients – whether they are from civil society or not – for the detailed development of the grant workplan and budget, since this is the point at which specific programs and details are worked out. The recommendations developed during the civil society dialogue will continue to be relevant to this process, and as with the concept note process, civil society organizations should delegate individuals to participate, in an open and transparent way, in grant-making discussions.
Registration

Welcome and introduction
Agree on agenda and meeting objectives.
1. Share information about the current status of the response to the three diseases.
2. What are the current strengths and weaknesses of the civil society contribution to the national response to the three diseases?
3. What support is available from technical assistance groups and partners to the civil society caucusing process?
4. Based on this information, develop preliminary priorities for inclusion by civil society in the country concept note.
5. Plan for continued consultations and dialogue as appropriate

Session I: Understand the Global Fund
Understanding existing Global Fund grants in your country and the Global Fund’s new funding model, including the types of programming the Global Fund will support to address health systems strengthening, community systems strengthening, human rights, and gender equality. Include time for discussion and questions and answers.

BREAK

Session II: Current status
What is the current state of the response to the three diseases? What are the unmet needs? What is the current status of the national strategic plan – is it sufficiently robust according to civil society and Global Fund criteria? Have barriers been clearly identified, and have the relevant human rights, gender and community systems strategies to address these barriers been identified? Note that these presentations should provide not only a description of the current epidemiological data (including gaps in data), but also of current health service coverage levels and financial gap analysis. Include time for discussion and questions and answers.

LUNCH

Session III: Small group work
Based on the morning sessions, groups break up by thematic area such as treatment, prevention, care and support; community systems strengthening; health systems strengthening; and human rights. Organizers should ensure subgroups of civil society – such as key populations, gender champions, people affected by the diseases and nongovernmental organizations – are well represented in each. Small groups will brainstorm priority interventions and report back to plenary for discussion.

BREAK

Session IV: Internal governance
Assess current strengths and weaknesses in the existing consultation mechanisms civil society uses regarding the Global Fund in your country and agree on corrective actions. Develop terms of reference for drafting team members and agree on a simple process for nominating and selecting participants.

Session V: Action steps and way forward
Discuss when draft priorities will be available for further review and consultation. Who will be responsible for seeking out and gathering additional input? Which subgroups were missing from the consultation that need to be reached out to in particular? Who will take responsibility for that task?
This guide was developed with members of the Joint Civil Society Action Plan Task Team and their constituencies. This group is composed of the Global Fund, technical partners, civil society representatives, and representatives of key population, human rights and gender organizations.