

Global Fund Policies on Sustainability, Transitions and Co-Financing

This document presents the results of a high-level analysis commissioned by the Developed Country NGO Delegation (on behalf of the Implementers Group STC Task Team) of the Global Fund's Policies related to Sustainability, Transitions and Co-financing (STC). The high-level analysis was undertaken to help guide the efforts of the Global Fund Strategy Committee and the Board. Further information regarding the results presented in this paper, including access to the data collected is available from [Mike Podmore](#) (Alternate Board Member of the Developed Country NGO Delegation to the Board of the Global Fund), [Nick Corby](#) or [Kanna Dharmarajah](#) (Equal International).

Background

The Global Fund's approach to sustainability, transitions and co-financing is primarily set out in the Global Fund's [Sustainability, Transition and Co-financing Policy \[GF/B35/04\]](#). Several other Global Fund policies and initiatives including the [Global Fund's Eligibility Policy \[GF/B35/06\]](#), [Challenging Operating Environments Policy \[GF/B35/03\]](#) and the [Emergency Fund Special Initiative](#) also relate to and impact upon STC issues.

While the Global Fund's STC Policy is reflective of Board Decisions and Global Fund-related initiatives since 2007 (see Annex 1), the STC Policy itself was first implemented in 2016. As a result, it is too soon to see tangible results regarding the impact of the STC Policy. The analysis presented in this document does not attempt to explore the impact of the STC Policy. Instead, the analysis draws upon existing Global Fund Board decisions, operational guidelines, policy papers, NGO submissions, letters and analysis (n.81 – full list available separately) addressing the Global Fund's approach to sustainability, transitions and co-financing as well as interviews of key stakeholders (n.15) including Global Fund staff, regional representation and coverage of the three diseases to provide recommendations for how to strengthen the current implementation of the STC Policy. See Annex 2 for the complete list of interviewees.

This document presents 4 key areas that are fundamental to addressing sustainability, transition and co-financing across the Global Fund portfolio: 1) Catalytic investment priorities relevant to STC 2) The Eligibility Policy 3) Procurement 4) the operationalization and review of the STC Policy. It presents information and evidence, suggestions for improved operationalisation and review of STC-related policies and, where relevant, possible policy change/addition to address policy-level challenges.

1. Catalytic investment priorities

Up to US\$800 million has been made available for Catalytic Investments for the 2017-2019 Allocation Period ([GF/B36/04 – Revision 2](#)), in accordance with the allocation methodology approved in April 2016 under decision point GF/B35/DP10 and set forth in Annex 1 to GF/B35/05 – Revision 1. The Catalytic Investments include, but are not restricted to, multi-country approaches and strategic initiatives.

Harnessing catalytic investment and strategic initiative funding could strengthen sustainability and transition preparedness planning. The STC policy (Part 1: Sustainably; 7c) recognises that multi-country approaches are a tool to support advocacy and for addressing barriers to the provision of or access to health care in situations where political constraints

prevent domestic investment in interventions for people living with, affected, or at risk of HIV, TB and Malaria.

Multi-country approaches can also play an important role in supporting advocacy efforts and ensuring that transition policies are implemented and sufficiently funded. This includes work on exposing the impact of rapid donor withdrawal, influencing donor priorities and monitoring funding commitments, pushing donors to develop transition policies and allocate funding for their implementation, supporting dialogue between different stakeholders at regional and global level, and tracking progress at country level. **Considering that Global Fund country grants often lack support for advocacy, regional networks play an important role in channelling advocacy funding,** supporting capacity building for civil society groups in such areas as human rights and budget advocacy, and facilitating the dialogue between the civil society and government. The review on regional and multi-country programs discussed at the 29th TERG meeting (6-7 June 2016) concluded that these grants can provide significant benefits in encouraging regional dialogue and recommended that the grants focus on advocacy, and transition planning, as sustainability is a major weakness. Similarly, The [Development Continuum Working Group](#) also acknowledged the importance of regional investments addressing regional policy gaps and strengthening regional-level advocacy to support transitions and key and vulnerable populations. The Technical Review Panel's review ([GF/B35/13 Board Information](#)) recommended that regional and multi-country approaches should focus on the sustainability of interventions, or have high potential for sustainable outcomes.

A full review is required of the application of Catalytic Investments to the implementation of the STC Policy to explore how to support i) transition countries and UMICs not on the OECD list but currently facing barriers to prevention and treatment services due to limited domestic investment, or ii) countries who after transition funding has ended will be ineligible to receive Global Fund country allocations but will still require additional support.

This analysis was unable to identify clear processes regarding savings from approved Catalytic Investments or the recovery of funds from country allocations. Interviewees suggested that savings or recovered funds could be used to support innovative regional or national funding mechanisms designed to fund essential services, human rights and advocacy programming during transition or to deliver 'high impact' interventions in transitioned countries. **Further analysis is required to identify the potential value of saved or recovered funds and how best to use these funds.**

More details are required from the CRG department regarding how the US\$500,000 set-aside in 2016 and extended to June 2017 has been spent and/ or will be used for sustainability and transition technical assistance in Latin America and the Caribbean, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, South Africa and the Asia Pacific region.

Finally, **no information was found through this analysis on the countries that will be supported through the 1.1. Strategic Initiative on Sustainability, Transition and Efficiency (US\$15 million)** under Strategic priority on Sustainability, Service Delivery and Health Workforce. The focus of this Strategic Initiative could be on countries undergoing transition with low transition readiness scores and countries whose transition during 2014-2016 allocation period was not properly planned or hindered by legal and political barriers. These countries include Macedonia, Moldova, Malaysia (transition planning), Montenegro, Bulgaria, Romania (TB), Albania, Thailand and Georgia.

2. Eligibility Policy evaluation

The [Global Fund Strategy 2017-2022 \(GF/B35/02 Revision 1\)](#) commits the Global Fund to tailoring its eligibility approach not only to the disease burden and income level of a country, but also to considering other factors, including: the epidemiologic and socio-political context, financing gaps, fiscal space, absorptive capacity, risk and where and how the Global Fund, with partners, can have the most catalytic impact.

Evidence gathered during the analysis supports the importance attached by the Global Fund to determining eligibility using more criteria than just disease burden and income. The [Equitable Access Initiative Report](#) identified that using income levels in decisions about eligibility and prioritization overlooks key considerations such as (a) large variations in the distribution of disease; (b) poverty and inequality within countries; (c) the capacity of the health systems within countries; (d) the capacity of governments; and (e) governments' policy choices towards their citizens.

While a very limited number of interviewees offered some support for the Global Fund's existing Eligibility Policy, all recognised it had severe limitations. Most interviewees were highly critical of the Global Fund's Eligibility Policy; one reported surprise that it had not been recently reviewed. One particular concern raised by interviewees included a negative trend in health outcomes in regions now seeing a fall in donor funding. Eastern Europe and Central Asia is home to the fastest growing HIV epidemic (annual numbers of new HIV infections in eastern Europe and central Asia increased by 57%)¹ and the highest levels of multidrug-resistant TB in the world². After years of steady decline, the Caribbean saw a 9% rise in annual new HIV infections among adults between 2010 and 2015³. **In the Middle East and North Africa, annual new HIV infections increased by 4% between 2010 and 2015⁴.** During this allocation period the EECA, MENA and LAC all experienced reductions in allocated funding. Another concern raised by interviewees was an apparent unwillingness or hesitancy by governments to continuing and expanding programs aimed at key populations. In Bulgaria, the allocation of financial resources for HIV prevention is mostly limited to HIV awareness-raising among young people. **There is limited political will to focus on HIV prevention among key populations.** In Serbia, the Global Fund supported more than fifty organizations providing services for PWID, MSM, sex workers, and Roma. The Government's 2015 national HIV budget allocated just 3% of funding for HIV prevention, with no funds at all for key populations. Programs serving 3,000 people who inject drugs in seven cities, including in the three largest cities of Novi Sad, Belgrade, and Nis, drastically cut or stopped services. An NGO that had been reaching more than 3,000 men who have sex with men estimates will reach 500—a drop of almost 85%⁵. In Mexico, the withdrawal of the Global Fund was accompanied by severe disruption to harm reduction programs—and no

¹ UNAIDS Global AIDS Update (2016). Can be accessed at: http://www.who.int/hiv/pub/arv/global-AIDS-update-2016_en.pdf?ua=1

² TB Europe Coalition (2016). "Transitioning from donor support. HIV and TB programmes in Eastern Europe and Central Asia: challenges and effective solution". Can be accessed at: <http://www.tbcoalition.eu/2016/04/25/tbecs-position-paper-challenges-and-solutions-for-sustainable-transition-from-donor-support-in-eastern-europe-and-central-asia/>

³ http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/presscentre/pressreleaseandstatementarchive/2016/july/20160712_prevention-gap

⁴ UNAIDS Prevention Gap Report (2016). Can be accessed at: http://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/2016-prevention-gap-report_en.pdf

⁵ Open Society Foundations, Ready, Willing and Able? Challenges faced by countries losing Global Fund Support (2015).

plan for transition to ensure continuity of services. Multiple NGOs in northern Mexico, where injecting drug use is a common risk factor for HIV, reported that the distribution of needles and syringes per injecting drug user fell by between 60 to 90 percent following cessation of Global Fund support⁶. In Romania, the cessation of Global Fund funding coincided with a dramatic increase in HIV among PWIDs especially in the capital, Bucharest. In 2009, prior to the end of Global Fund support, HIV prevalence among PWIDs was estimated at 1.1%. HIV prevalence then rose dramatically to 6.9% in 2012 and spiked at 53% in 2013⁷.

A full review of the Global Fund's Eligibility Policy is required to ensure it remains 'fit for purpose'. Interviewees for this analysis suggested that any such review should i) consider required changes to the measure of disease burden (e.g. moving from prevalence to incidence for HIV and TB and/ or introducing a measure regarding disease burden among key populations) and the effect of any changes to eligible and ineligible countries, ii) examine the impact on health or service delivery of the time required before transitioned countries are eligible again for Global Fund support, and iii) explore options for a new 'NGO Rule' across the three diseases that supports service delivery by non-state service providers in transition countries at least until an effective government contract mechanism is established.

3. Procurement

Global Fund data identifies that approximately half of all Global Fund financing is currently used to finance commodities [GF/SC03/04]. No direct evidence was found during this analysis that shows transitioning and transitioned countries have not procured commodities previously obtained using Global Fund support. Evidence did emerge to suggest that in certain circumstances governments may not sustain the procurement of certain commodities to prevent a break in the continuity of Global Fund supported services and/ or the reversal of health gains. Numerous examples exist of governments not committing funding to meet the health needs of the country's poorest⁸ or unwilling to sustain services to key populations typically delivered by civil society organizations⁹.

Evidence gathered suggests that the challenges presented to transitioning and transitioned countries by the need to procure commodities previously obtained using Global Fund support is often compounded by the growing costs of essential commodities. Prices of newer ARVs and treatment for MDR TB and Hepatitis C appear to be rising due to increased patenting, which excludes or limits the availability of low-cost generic production and supply, or the ability to procure improved formulations. Middle-income and/ or Global Fund transitioning countries are reported to be particularly affected because they also face the withdrawal of donor funding (including from the Global Fund) and exclusion from voluntary licenses for generic supply.

⁶ Open Society Foundations, Ready, Willing and Able? Challenges faced by countries losing Global Fund Support (2015).

⁷ EHRN and ICASO, The Impact of Transition from Global Fund support to Governmental funding on Sustainability of Harm Reduction programs: Case study from Romania Eurasian Harm Reduction Network (2016).

⁸ Todd Summers and Katherine Peck (Commissioned by the Center for Strategic and International studies), India and the Global Fund: Implications for Discussions on Transition and Sustainability (2014)

⁹ Letter to Global Fund Board from Aleksey Korolkov, Chairman of the Coordinating Committee of the Global Fund Program in the Russian Federation (2016).

Further analysis is needed to identify to what extent Global Fund policies support countries to access affordable commodities before and after transition. This analysis will provide valuable insights with which the Board can strengthen how transitioning and transitioned countries sustain the procurement of commodities, but **it must focus on all procurement-related support provided by the Global Fund (e.g. technical support regarding legislation) and not focused solely on WAMBO.**

WAMBO is an innovative tool developed by the Global Fund to grant increased access to quality-assured, affordable health products to countries. It is an online purchasing platform that gives Principal Recipients of Global Fund funding access to commodities at Global Fund-negotiated prices. The Report of the [Development Continuum Working Group](#) raised the possibility that transitioning countries or already graduated countries might be able to benefit from Global Fund-negotiated prices for a fixed period of time. The Global Fund website also acknowledges that the plan is to expand WAMBO to all users with external funding. **Further analysis is needed to clarify how exactly MICs and transitioning or transitioned countries can benefit from WAMBO while retaining alternative methods to help drive down drug prices such as the threat and use of TRIPS flexibilities.**

In addition to WAMBO, further analysis of the Global Fund's policies that support countries to access affordable commodities could also explore how to make available technical support to negotiate concessionary prices as well as build and/ or strengthen robust procurement systems. The Report of the [Development Continuum Working Group](#) recognized the need for this. There is also a growing recognition that an enhanced focus in grants on procurement systems is necessary to prepare countries for transition [GF/SC03/04]. **The Global Fund could explore providing support to strengthen procurement systems as a catalytic priority, financed using recovered funding from country allocations, supported through portfolio optimisation and/ or as a special initiative.**

Finally, the case of Venezuela suggests there are other flexibilities within the Global Fund's policies that support countries to access affordable commodities that need to be better defined. The Global Fund has never operated a grant in Venezuela. The country is also ineligible for a country grant under the Global Fund's eligibility policy. A letter from the Global Fund Board to the Board Members of RVG+ Network of Positive People Venezuelan (2017), though, highlighted that the Board would consider i) a request for short-term assistance to lead activities for better access to competitive pricing for emergency procurement of commodities and ii) a request for longer-term support through a multi-country grant to address the regional consequences of Venezuela's increasing malaria rates. Venezuela was also refused funding under the Global Fund's Emergency Fund because a Global Fund target group was not at risk in terms of continuity of services, it wasn't classified by the UN as a humanitarian emergency, the money available from the Emergency Fund was inadequate and it was an ineligible country. One interviewee acknowledged that the fact that Venezuela was not a UN declared emergency is less important, this is not a Board requirement but a method used to operationalise the Fund. The fact there was not a Global Fund target group and that it was an ineligible country presented more problems, these are requirements in Board documents and would need Board sign off to circumvent. Would the Global Fund Board permit a grant for an ineligible country if a Global Fund target group was at severe risk in terms of continuity of services? **Further analysis is needed of the scope of the Emergency Fund regarding access to commodities, the role of regional grants and the**

ability of ineligible countries to access short-term catalytic funding that supports access to commodities.

4. STC Policy review and evaluation

The need to strengthen monitoring and evaluation systems has previously been recognized by numerous Global Fund reviews and analyses. The [Sustainability Review of Global Fund Supported HIV, Tuberculosis and Malaria Programmes: Final Report Commissioned by the Technical Evaluation Reference Group \(TERG\) of the Global Fund \(2013\)](#) recognized the importance that **any sustainability plan includes a robust monitoring and evaluation and reporting framework**. The [Report of the Technical Review Panel on Concept Notes submitted in the third and fourth windows of the funding model \(2015\)](#) emphasized the need for transition plans to include details on how adequate monitoring of service delivery (preventive, curative and care) for key populations will be assured. Programmatic monitoring and oversight of the transition and/ or national strategy has, however, remained weak in many transition countries. In Montenegro, there is no Government-endorsed plan to monitor or report on the transition strategy or the National AIDS Strategy in place of the Country Coordinating Mechanism. Accountability mechanisms that monitor and enforce the implementation of transition plans are essential.

The monitoring and evaluation of transition countries needs to extend beyond efforts (or not) to sustain health services and interventions, it must also extend to the transition process itself. A TERG position paper on sustainability [GF/SIIC16/03 (2015)] emphasized the necessity for more analysis within the Global Fund Secretariat on factors (enablers and disablers) associated with successful transition. This analysis was unable to identify any other reference to or recognition of the need to learn from the STC approach on an ongoing basis, suggesting that this is overlooked or taken for granted that it will happen.

Greater focus should be given to monitoring and learning from transitions as the STC policy is implemented, to consistently adapt and strengthen the operationalization of the policy as necessary. The Global Fund Secretariat has a central role to play in designing and rolling out an effective internal learning approach as it further strengthens its internal organization to deliver on the STC policy. **The Global Fund should review further its plans in regard to monitoring and learning from transitions and strengthening them, where necessary, particularly to i) clearly define what counts as a successful transition with clear indicators on transition and sustainability for countries, for use by in-country accountability mechanisms to track successes or flag emerging challenges to the Board, and ii) review all transitions on a regular basis, producing a progress report to the Board and identifying critical enablers or disablers for transition to help improve future transitions.** The evidence produced would also help to formally evaluate the success of the STC Policy.

Finally, interviewees highlighted the absence of a mechanism in many transition countries capable of playing **a valuable watchdog role** in regard to transition, assessing progress against the transition plan and/ or national strategy, tracking changes to the epidemic and holding governments accountable. In Serbia, for example, it was reported that the Country Coordinating Mechanism has not met since the Global Fund's withdrawal and the National Commission for HIV/AIDS that predated the Country Coordinating Mechanism has not functioned for five years. As a result, no one is held accountable to implement the transition plan and there is no legitimate space for civil society organizations to voice concerns. **Options for how best to routinely establish an accountability mechanism should be reviewed in full, including funding regional civil society organizations to independently review and support the national response on the completion of transition and enhance**

sustainability.

5. Conclusion

While the Global Fund's STC Policy is reflective of Board Decisions and Global Fund-related initiatives since 2007, the STC Policy has not yet been implemented for one full year. As a result, it is not currently possible to conduct a robust and meaningful evaluation of the impact of the STC Policy. The high-level analysis completed to produce this paper was not intended to examine the impact of the STC Policy, instead the analysis seeks simply to help strengthen the operationalisation of the STC Policy.

We also recognise that the efforts of the Global Fund Secretariat to implement the STC Policy are relatively new and still evolving. The high-level analysis conducted was certainly not intended to evaluate efforts taken to date to operationalise the STC Policy. Instead, the analysis was intended to support the Global Fund Secretariat's ongoing work in this area by highlighting important areas of concern for further investigation or discussion. Namely:

1.	A full review is required of the application of Catalytic Investments to the implementation of the STC Policy to explore how to support i) transition countries and UMICs not on the OECD list but currently facing barriers to prevention and treatment services due to limited domestic investment, or ii) countries who after transition funding has ended will be ineligible to receive Global Fund country allocations but will still require additional support.
2.	Further analysis is required to identify the potential value of saved or recovered funds and how best to use these funds.
3.	A full review of the Global Fund's Eligibility Policy is required to ensure it remains 'fit for purpose'. Interviewees for this analysis suggested that any such review should i) consider required changes to the measure of disease burden (e.g. moving from prevalence to incidence for HIV and TB and/ or introducing a measure regarding disease burden among key populations) and the effect of any changes to eligible and ineligible countries, ii) examine the impact on health or service delivery of the time required before transitioned countries are eligible again for Global Fund support, and iii) explore options for a new 'NGO Rule' across the three diseases that supports service delivery by non-state service providers in transition countries at least until an effective government contract mechanism is established.
4.	Further analysis is needed to identify to what extent Global Fund policies support countries to access affordable commodities before and after transition. This analysis will provide valuable insights with which the Board can strengthen how transitioning and transitioned countries sustain the procurement of commodities, but it must focus on all procurement-related support provided by the Global Fund (e.g. technical support regarding legislation) and not focused solely on WAMBO.
5.	Further analysis is needed to clarify how exactly MICs and transitioning or transitioned countries can benefit from WAMBO while retaining alternative methods to help drive down drug prices such as the threat and use of TRIPS flexibilities.
6.	The Global Fund could explore providing support to strengthen procurement systems as a catalytic priority, financed using recovered funding from country allocations, supported through portfolio optimisation and/ or as a special initiative.
7.	Further analysis is needed of the scope of the Emergency Fund regarding access to commodities, the role of regional grants and the ability of ineligible countries to access short-term catalytic funding that supports access to commodities.
8.	The Global Fund should review further its plans in regard to monitoring and learning from transitions and strengthening them, where necessary, particularly to i) clearly

	define what counts as a successful transition with clear indicators on transition and sustainability for countries, for use by in-country accountability mechanisms to track successes or flag emerging challenges to the Board, and ii) review all transitions on a regular basis, producing a progress report to the Board and identifying critical enablers or disablers for transition to help improve future transitions.
9.	Options for how best to routinely establish an accountability mechanism should be reviewed in full, including funding regional civil society organizations to independently review and support the national response on the completion of transition and enhance sustainability.

Annex 1: Global Fund Sustainability, Transition and Co-financing activity timeline

Date	Activity/Policy/Document/Decisions	Details
27 Apr 2007	Global Fund Board recommends Dual Track Financing and provision for Strengthening the Role of Civil Society and the Private Sector in the Global Fund's Work	<p>Board Decision Point GF/B15/DP14: The Board approves provisions for Strengthening the Role of Civil Society and the Private Sector in the Global Fund's Work. The Board further expresses its desire for strengthened and scaled-up civil-society and private-sector involvement at both the country and Board levels, while recognizing the respective strengths and roles of the two sectors:</p> <p>The Board recommends the submission of proposals with both government and non-government PRs ("dual-track financing").</p>
15 Dec 2010	Review of the Global Fund Eligibility and Cost Sharing Policy	<p>Board Decision Point GF/B22/DP08: The Board approves the Review of the Eligibility and Cost Sharing Policy</p> <p>Refers to its decision at the Sixteenth Board Meeting to review the Income Level and Cost Sharing Criteria for determining eligibility for funding (GF/B16/DP18).</p>
May 2011	GF/B23/14 Revised Eligibility and Counterpart Financing Requirements and Prioritization adopted	<p>Board Decision Point GF/B23/DP23: The Board approves the document entitled "Policy on Eligibility Criteria, Counterpart Financing Requirements, and Prioritization of Proposals for Funding from the Global Fund" as set out in Attachment 1 (GF/B23/14)</p> <p>The policy includes a "NGO Rule" which states that for HIV/AIDS funding applications, an Upper Middle Income Country that is not on the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee ('OECD-DAC') list of Overseas Development Assistance ("ODA") recipients is only eligible if the application is submitted by a non-government organization ("NGO") and under specific conditions.</p>
26 Jan 2012	Board approves Application of NGO Rule to the Transitional Funding Mechanism	<p>Board Decision Point GF/B25/EDP21- Board approves Application of NGO Rule to the Transitional Funding Mechanism. Notwithstanding the effect of Decision 1 (GF/B25/EDP20 applied post factum) above, paragraph 11 of the Global Fund's 'Policy on Eligibility Criteria, Counterpart Financing Requirements, and Prioritization of Proposals' (GF/B23/14), which allows NGOs from Upper Middle Income Countries not listed on the OECD's DAC list of ODA recipients to apply for HIV/AIDS funding, shall remain applicable to the Transitional Funding Mechanism.</p>
2013	Launch of New Funding Model	STC built into the NFM- based on GNI and disease burden, with Co-financing rule and willingness to pay criteria

Apr 2013	TERG conducts a thematic review on the sustainability of Global Fund-supported programs in 2013 focusing on financial issues	The Global Fund commissioned a review aimed at identifying issues related to sustainability of Global Fund supported programs; provide lessons for countries in similar situations and to inform the development of a “sustainability strategy” for Global Fund supported programs going forward.
8 Nov 2013	GF/B30/6 – Revision 1 Revision of the Policy on Eligibility Criteria, Counterpart Financing Requirements and Prioritization of Proposals for Funding from the Global Fund	<p>Board Decision Point GF/B30/DP05: Board approved the amended “Eligibility and Counterpart Financing Policy” in order to align it with the new funding model. In addition, the Board requested the Strategy, Investment and Impact Committee and the Secretariat to initiate a process that by the end of 2014 will provide options and recommendations to the Board to refine the Global Fund’s approach to transitioning countries. This approach shall include consideration of appropriate public health indicators to measure progress in sustaining and enhancing gains against the three diseases.</p> <p>The revised application focus and co-financing requirements set forth in will supersede the application focus and co-financing requirements contained in the “Eligibility and Counterpart Financing Policy”.</p> <p>Inclusion of a grace period for countries currently funded under the ‘NGO Rule’ To address concerns with respect to maintaining funding for civil society for key services not being provided by governments, the revised Policy permits existing HIV grants funded under the ‘NGO-Rule’ to receive a grace-period of one allocation period after they become ineligible due to changes in their income-level classifications.</p> <p>According to the 2013 Eligibility List, five UMI countries (i.e., Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania and Russian Federation) were technically eligible to apply for funding in 2013 under this ‘NGO Rule’.</p> <p>Currently only applies to Russia</p>
2014	Incorporation of a ‘willingness to pay’ requirement when the funding model was launched in	‘willingness to pay’ requirement has contributed to an additional US\$ 6 billion in domestic commitments for health over expenditures from the previous period, which represents a major increase in domestic financing for health.
2014	The Development Continuum Working Group convened by the Global Fund Secretariat	The Development Continuum Working is a time-limited group to assist in understanding the evolving health and development landscape, highlighting the resulting implications for the Global Fund, and providing suggestions to the Global Fund on how to improve the strategic impact and effectiveness of the Global Fund’s engagement with countries across the development continuum.
7 Mar 2014	GF/B31/08A – Revision 1 Global Fund Board approves Funds for Special Initiatives	Board Decision Point GF/B31/DP06: Board approves funding for Special Initiatives, including: USD 30 million for the Humanitarian Emergency Fund

Nov 2014	Board identified sustainability as a priority at its November 2014 retreat	During the Board Retreat of 2014, the Board acknowledged that with the elaboration of the Global Fund's next 5-year strategy, discussions of sustainability and transition are more pertinent now than ever due to the changing global health landscape. This landscape is characterized by more constrained donor budgets; a focus on domestic resource mobilization due to expanding economic growth, and the movement of previously low-income countries into middle-income status
2015	Global Fund Strategic Review 2015 conducted by the Global Fund's Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG)	<p>GF/SIIC16/06 Strategic Review 2015: TERG Position Paper to the Global Fund Board</p> <p>The TERG Strategic Review emphasized that in the present cycle, limited progress had been made in enhancing the sustainability of Global Fund investments, and sustainability and transition planning remain poorly operationalized within many countries. There was inadequate support towards mobilizing resources from the private sector and towards ensuring that non-governmental (e.g. civil society) contributions to the health sector can be sustained.</p> <p>Recommendation 6: Act on sustainability now - start now to plan for and operationalize sustainability initiatives.</p>
2015	The Equitable Access Initiative (EAI) launched	The Equitable Access Initiative (EAI) launched by the heads of multilateral organizations engaged in global health: GAVI, the Global Fund, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNITAID, the World Bank and WHO. The purpose was to consider alternatives to GNI as a framework to assess countries' need for external financial support for health
2015	Curatio International Foundation develops a Transition Preparedness Assessment (TPA) Framework	The development of the framework is funded by Global Fund and is piloted in four Eastern European countries Belarus, Bulgaria, Georgia, Ukraine.
17 Mar 2015	Report of the Development Continuum Working Group" presented to the Board in March 2015	<p>Development Continuum Working Group report "Evolving the Global Fund for Greater Impact in a Changing Global Landscape:</p> <p>Key points:</p> <p>The Global Fund should support country efforts to include sustainability planning from grant inception, consider more appropriate metrics for eligibility and transition (through the EAI and additional efforts), and establish a responsible transition policy that seeks to ensure sustained impact against the three diseases, particularly for key populations. Options for consideration include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an operational definition of sustainability • Require a "country compact" or a sustainability plan • Utilize more appropriate transition criteria and benchmarks • Conduct a transition readiness assessment

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage with the Ministries of Finance early • Ensure alignment with country systems • Promote access to pharmaceuticals • Provide support for new technology assessments • Explore flexible and alternative grant agreements • Allocate specific funds towards transition planning and related activities
7-8 May 2015	The Global Fund Partnership Forum, Addis Ababa	<p>Meeting Report: Recommendations 08 Sustainability and Transition Develop a sustainability and transition strategy with the goal to guarantee continuation and expansion of services for affected populations; attract additional resources from current and new public and private sources; support countries to increase domestic resource mobilization for health.</p>
16-17 Jun 2015	Strategy, Investment and Impact Committee paper on Sustainability and Transitions for Committee Discussion	<p>GF/SIIC15/10: Secretariat paper on Sustainability and Transition Purpose of the paper is to provide an overview on Sustainability and Transitions in the context of preparing for the Global Fund’s 2017-2021 Strategy – for SIIC discussion</p>
24-25 Jun 2015	The Global Fund Partnership Forum, Bangkok	<p>Meeting Report: 3 Transition and Sustainability On the themes of transition and sustainability, participants discussed issues such as the need to establish a “mentality of sustainability” in the Global Fund culture, the role of civil society, key affected populations, and communities, the link with HSS and</p>
13-14 July 2015	Communities and Civil Society Consultation on the Global Fund Strategy in Chisinau, Moldova	<p>Civil society’s main position on this subject was that the Global Fund must assess a country’s readiness to transition based on different criteria, not just income classification and overall disease burden. Participants called for consideration of the work of the Equitable Access Initiative (EAI) and a “transition readiness assessment” tool. Furthermore, delegates prioritized sourcing other funding for civil society to continue working with key populations if countries are unable or unwilling to continue programming, especially ensuring that the focus of this work addresses legal barriers and community systems strengthening</p>
21-22 July 2015	Regional Consultation on Transition and Sustainability of HIV and TB responses in Eastern Europe and Central Asia	<p>EHRN and Global Fund Technical consultation in Istanbul, Turkey on the transition to domestic funding of HIV and TB responses and their programmatic sustainability in Eastern Europe and Central Asia (EECA).</p> <p>The aim of this consultation was to draft a Framework for Sustainability and Transition for countries transitioning from Global Fund support in EECA.</p>
29 July 2015	Medecins Sans Frontieres (MSF) Letter to the Global Fund: ‘A call to keep the Global Fund effective at saving lives in all developing	<p>Key points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize outputs and outcomes over the call for sustainability. • Adjust the funding model without narrowly defining country eligibility and restricting country

	countries through its 2017-2021 strategy’	demand.
3-4 Sep 2015	The Global Fund Partnership Forum, Buenos Aires	Meeting report: 04 Sustainability and Transition Discussions centered in large part around issues of transition and sustainability for middle-income countries, two very tangible concerns for partners in the LAC and EECA regions. With regard to transition, participants noted that the Global Fund should be more actively and effectively engaged in advocacy efforts and policy dialogue with the government, so as to ensure country ownership in the development of a sustainable transition plan. It was noted that this should be done in cooperation with other donors, partners and national stakeholders, with defined milestones for addressing the requirements of transition: increased budget, legal framework, governance, civil society engagement, financing for key populations, effective procurement systems and price reduction for drugs/use of e-market. A further recommendation, echoed by most, was to add sustainability and transition as a separate strategic objective in the new Global Fund 2017-21 strategy, and include strong key performance indicators.
28-30 Sep 2015	Regional High Level Dialogue on Successful Transition to Domestic Funding of HIV and TB Response in Eastern Europe and Central Asia (EECA) countries “ROAD TO SUCCESS” Tbilisi, Georgia,	The Regional Dialogue brought together representatives of governments of EECA countries, civil society organizations, key populations and communities, international organizations and technical agencies with the goal of discussing commitments and principles of the successful transition from donor to national funding of HIV and TB responses http://www.harm-reduction.org/regional-dialogue-summary
Sep 2015	GF/SIIC16/03 Committee Information on TERG Position Paper on Sustainability presented to the SIIC	The purpose of this Position Paper is to provide the SIIC and the Board with a summary and TERG’s assessment of the thematic review report; to endorse key issues identified within the report; and to provide TERG’s opinions and recommendations, positioned within the broader conversation on sustainability and the new Global Fund Strategy
Nov 2015	Open Letter from Civil Society to the Global Fund Board on Allocation Methodology Framework and Sustainability and Transition	Letter from organizations representing civil society including key affected populations from different Eastern Europe and Central Asia (EECA) countries and their partner organizations from other regions Letter to the Global Fund Board for the 34 th Global Fund Board meeting 16-17 November 2015. Calling on GF Board to develop a Sustainability & Transition Strategy and an implementation plan
Nov 2015	The Board approves the Strategic Framework 2017 – 2022	Board Decision Point GF/B34/DP04: Board approves the Strategic Framework 2017 – 2022- Includes sub-objective to “support sustainable responses for epidemic control and successful transitions.” The policy presented in this paper for Board approval outlines the principles that will guide the Global Fund’s approach and engagement with respect to sustainability and successful transition.
Dec 2015	Recommendations provided to the Secretariat during the December 2015	

	internal and external consultations on Sustainability and Transition	
17 Dec 2015	Investment Case for the Global Fund’s 2017-2019 Replenishment	Paper titled ‘The Right Side of the Tipping Point For AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’ presented on 17 December 2015 at the Global Fund’s Fifth Replenishment Preparatory Meeting in Tokyo, Japan. Annex 2: Methodology for the Forecast of Domestic Financing and Other External Financing
2016	EHRN conducts a number of case studies in five Balkan countries: Albania, Bosnia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Romania.	The case studies are for evaluating the processes and the consequences of the transition from the Global Fund financing
25 Jan 2016	Report on Transition from Global Fund Support and Programmatic Sustainability Research in Four CEE/CIS countries by Curatio International Foundation	The goal of the synthesis report is to examine the experience of four middle-income EECA countries – Belarus, Bulgaria, Georgia and Ukraine – that have received grant support from the Global Fund and, in the near future, will have to prepare for transition out of Global Fund assistance in a way that assures the financial and programmatic sustainability of their TB and HIV responses
27 Apr 2016	GF/B35/02 Board approves The Global Fund Strategy 2017 – 2022: Investing to End Epidemics	Board Decision Point GF/B35/DP04: Based on the recommendation of the Strategy, Investment and Impact Committee, the Board approves the Global Fund Strategy 2017 - 2022: Investing to End Epidemics, as presented in Annex 1 to GF/B35/02 - Revision 1.
27 Apr 2016	GF/B35/04 – Revision 1 Strategy, Investment and Impact Committee recommends and presents the Sustainability, Transition and Co-financing Policy for Board Approval	Board Decision Point GF/B35/DP08: Board approves The Sustainability, Transition and Co-financing Policy 1. Based on the recommendation of the Strategy, Investment and Impact Committee, the Board approves the Sustainability, Transition and Co-Financing Policy, as set forth in Annex 1 to GF/B35/04 – Revision 1 (the “STC Policy”). Accordingly, the Board: a. Acknowledges this decision point and the new co-financing policy set forth in the STC Policy supersede Board decision point GF/B30/DP05 and the previous Counterpart Financing Policy as set forth in Attachment 1 to GF/B30/6 – Revision 1 (the “Counterpart Financing Policy”); and of this decision point, the Counterpart Financing Policy remains applicable to grant programs originating from the 2014 – 2016 allocation period.
27 Apr 2016	GF/B35/06 Revised Eligibility policy	Board Decision Point GF/B35/DP07: Board approves the revised Eligibility Policy, as set forth in Annex 2 to GF/B35/06 - Revision 1 (the "Revised Eligibility Policy"). This policy refines the Global Fund’s approach to transitioning countries, the revised Eligibility Policy set forth in this paper will supersede the eligibility policy contained in the “Eligibility and Counterpart

		<p>Financing Policy.” Revised to clarify that countries or components funded under an existing grant that become ineligible are eligible to receive up to one additional allocation for the allocation period immediately following their change in eligibility and allows for the Secretariat, based on country context and existing portfolio considerations, to determine the appropriate period and amount of funding for priority transition needs. Flexibilities with respect to Transition Funding, which are provided in the Sustainability, Transition and Co-financing (STC) Policy, as well as Challenging Operating Environments Policy, are also cross-referenced</p> <p>Counterpart financing requirements are part of the Sustainability, Transitions, and Co-financing (STC) policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update to NGO Rule and conditions • Countries noted as eligible for funding under the NGO rule in the current 2016 eligibility list include: Bulgaria (HIV), Romania (HIV) and Russia (HIV).
27 Apr 2016	GF/B35/05 – Revision 1 Allocation Methodology 2017-2019	<p>Board Decision Point GF/B35/DP10: Allocation Methodology 2017 – 2019</p> <p>For 2017-2019, a more refined, multi-faceted package of responses to meet the needs of concentrated burdens in higher income settings is proposed, entailing:</p> <p>a) Catalytic investments</p> <p>b) Ensuring scale up, impact and paced reductions in the allocation methodology: this approach will ensure funding amounts can be appropriately refined to protect the gains of previous investments and enable greater impact.</p> <p>c) Qualitative factor adjustments for 2017-2019</p> <p>d) Focus of application requirements: The Sustainability, Transition and Co-Financing (STC) that the SIIC is recommending for Board approval proposes that Global Fund financing in UMICs have 100% focus on key and vulnerable populations; and 50% in LMICs, as relevant to the country context.</p> <p>e) Co-Financing: the new STC Policy²⁶ also proposes that a minimum 50% of domestic contributions target key and vulnerable populations in UMICs.</p> <p>f) New KPIs 5 and 9A, B&C:</p>
Jun 2016	Training workshop on the use of transition preparedness assessment tool developed by Curatio International Foundation (CIF).	A training workshop was organised in the Armenian capital, Yerevan, where representatives of Armenia, Moldova, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan were trained on the use of the transition preparedness assessment tool developed by Curatio International Foundation (CIF).
30 Jun 2016	Equitable Access Initiative Report launched	<p>The equitable access initiative: final report</p> <p>The Equitable Access Initiative found that GNI per capita is an imperfect measurement for</p>

		understanding health needs and a government's capacity to invest in health. It recommends that policymaking should not rely solely on a single variable to inform complex health financing decisions, and suggests considering health need relative to income levels, as well as domestic capacity and policies
Oct 2016	Action plan to reverse destructive HIV financing trend in middle- income countries	International Civil Society Support (ICSS) and the Open Society Foundations (OSF) organized a gathering of 35 advocates from around the world to discuss the need for and methods to coordinate advocacy, capacity-building and communications efforts to address the funding crisis in middle-income countries
08 Nov 2016	Joint Statement of Romanian Civil Society Organizations in advance to the Thirty Sixth Meeting of the Global Fund Board	Representatives of Romanian civil society organizations, including people living with HIV and TB and key populations – expressed their deep concern about the potential disconnect between a successful replenishment and the small or non-existent allocations that will be made available for countries like Romania and upper middle income countries with HIV epidemics that are still not controlled.
14 Nov 2016	The coordinating Committee of the Global Fund in the Russian Federation sends letter to the Global Fund Board	The letter appeals to the Global Fund Board to consider maintaining funding for HIV prevention programs for vulnerable groups in the Russian Federation either according to the NGO rule or within the framework of regional grants
16 Nov 2016	GF/B36/03 Sources and Uses of Funds for the 2017 – 2019 Allocation Period	Board Decision Point GF/B36/DP05: Board approves allocations for 2017 – 2019 Allocation Period. Reductions in the following regions: EECA: 46%; LAC: 52%; EMRC: 26%
16 November 2016	GF/B36/04 – Revision 2 Catalytic Investments for the 2017-2019 Allocation Period	Board Decision Point GF/B36/DP06: Board approves Catalytic Investments for the 2017 – 2019 Allocation Period Two specific sources of funding for transitions and sustainability work: HIV: 1.1. key populations, sustainability and continuity \$50 million in E. Europe, Southeast Asia and LAC) HIV: 2. Human Rights RSSH: 1.1. Sustainability, Transition and Efficiency (13 Million)
2016	STC policy starts to be implemented and catalytic investment fund agreed with STC components	

Annex 2: Complete list of interviewees

Kerstin Åkerfeldt
Nicolas Cantau
Ana Filipovska
Matias Gomez
Nicole Gorman
Annelise Hirschmann
Sandra Irbe
Hristijan Jankuloski
R. D. Marte
Matt McGregor
Raminta Stuikyte
David Traynor
Peter van Rooijen
Sergey Votyagov
Omid Zamani