



Investing in our future

**The Global Fund**

To Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

## **Partnership Forum 2006**

Durban, South Africa, July 1<sup>st</sup> – July 3<sup>rd</sup>

PFSC Report to the 14<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting

Guatemala, 31 October - 3 November 2006



# Celebrating Successes & Overcoming Challenges

**Report of the Global Fund Partnership Forum: 2006**

**Dr Mandeep Dhaliwal**

**Lead Facilitator**

# PFSC Report - Contents

- Opening Ceremony
- e-Forum
- Value of the PF meeting
- Event programme
- Facilitation
- Logistics
- Representation
- Independent evaluation
- Budget vs Expenditure
- Secretariat feedback
- PFSC Recommendations
- Decision Point for 14<sup>th</sup> Board meeting

# Opening Ceremony

- 1. The Steering Committee should agree on and plan for an opening/social event commensurate with available resources and with a separate budget early in the preparation process.*

- Technologically efficient
- Wide and diverse participation
  - though under representation of women, Africans and Asians
- Worked through strategic themes
- Moderated discussion
- Lots of useful feedback
- Formal report produced
- Almost universal praise for the e-Forum model



- 1. The e-Forum is a valuable aspect of the Partnership Forum process and should be an integral part of any future Partnership Forum planning*

# Value of the PF meeting

1. *Continue the broad and inclusive nature of the participant list as there is value in including stakeholders not normally directly involved in Global Fund policy-making processes;*
2. *Maintain the separation of regional meetings and Partnership Forum as they have different objectives and serve different purposes.*
3. *Consider the possibility of linking with another international meeting if possible and appropriate to reduce costs (especially on scholarships).*

# Event programme

- Skills building sessions useful, but should be in main programme
- Focus on CCM's, PR's, Procurement, LFA's
- Operational issues provide for good discussion
- Strategic issues should be less prominent
- Allow for different levels of engagement
- Involve the secretariat more
- Interactive sessions work well
- Networking sessions very popular



# Event programme

1. *Integrate the skills building sessions into the main programme and concentrate on the 'big' issues*
2. *Reorient the strategy sessions to provide more information at the beginning and actively focus discussion on one or two key questions that are easily absorbed*
3. *Organize a session early in the programme on general Global Fund information, presented by the Secretariat*
4. *Finalize a draft agenda much earlier to inform participants about what to expect and to get feedback on it.*

# Facilitation

- 1. Hire professional facilitators and ensure they are well briefed and prepared for the sessions they will facilitate*
- 2. Brief facilitators to seek out new and different views - ensure those not normally represented at Global Fund meetings are speaking during the sessions*
- 3. More partnership (e.g. briefing meetings) between Lead Facilitator and Secretariat*
- 4. Allow increased Secretariat involvement in preparation for sessions and discussions*
- 5. Have additional facilitator logistical support to manage technical matters.*

1. *Start the planning process as early as possible with clear mandates and budgets for the PFSC*
2. *The Forum should be held in as many of the six UN languages as possible but ALL sessions should offer interpretation.*

# Representation

- 479 attendees
  - 414 participants from 118 countries
    - 188 funded
  - 50 secretariat
  - 12 facilitators
  - 3 e-Forum moderators
- Variety of sectors represented; balanced except for
  - Excess from Southern Africa
  - Omission of LFA's by mistake
  - Insufficient TB and Malaria representation
- Lack of visible participation by Board Members
- Networking opportunities appreciated by delegates

# Representation

- 1. The Secretariat needs a mandate to proceed with invitations much earlier so that invitation lists can be developed earlier*
- 2. Invitations must be issued at least 6 months before the event*
- 3. Visa complications must be addressed early in the process with the host country.*

- 1. The Secretariat should consider inviting a large group of media representatives to the Partnership Forum and conduct additional briefing workshops for media on the Global Fund and reporting on the three diseases as part of the main Forum.*

# Independent evaluation

- Independent evaluator: Dr Kate Taylor
  - Previous experience of the Fund through Private Sector delegation
  - Now working at IAVI
- Carried out 50 interviews
- Joined many sessions
- Surveyed facilitators
- Worked to develop participant survey
- Conducted ± 20 interviews with people who were not at the PF
  - GF, RBM, Stop TB, BCG, McKinsey, others
- Wealth of information obtained from multiple stakeholders
- High level directional findings now; detailed (granular) findings in final report

# Defining the key issue

## Primary question

Should the Partnership Forum continue in its current incarnation as part of the governance structure of the Global Fund?

Yes

No

Change key elements of the PF's format

Change the Global Fund's governance structure

## Subsidiary issues

- How to decide?
- What are the governance/ strategic/ operational/ communications implications of different choices?
- What other lessons were learned from PFs 1 and 2?



# Independent evaluation

## PF participant perspectives were largely favorable



Investing in our future

**The Global Fund**

To Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

Promoting democracy and dialogue is invaluable. Having a space for people to talk is not something you can measure. You can only measure if you think about what would happen if it didn't take place. There would be much accumulated frustration at the selfishness of constituencies and therefore more [harmful] rigidity of relationships.

From a private sector perspective, you also need to think what is the risk of not having the PF. If you tried to save the 600 thousand dollars and just made decisions in Geneva, what would we miss? 600 thousand out of more than 5 billion of funds disbursed: if you don't value input as being worth at least 1 percent, you are running a risk. The PF mitigates the risk.

I don't think there was much added value to policy development. The value was from operational people. Therefore I wonder if a regional model would be better.

The PF is part of what makes the Global Fund unique. This is an amazing investment. The beauty of the Global Fund is to overcome the challenge of the outsiders and the insiders, who's on the CCM and who's not, who's a PR or a sub-recipient.

How to replace the PF would not be simple. We'd have to go to a UN model of everyone on the Board, but it would not be as effective.

*14<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting  
Guatemala, 31 October -3 November 2006*

# Independent evaluation

- Alternative models
  - E-forum – NO, not as a standalone alternative
    - Relatively women, Africans, SE Asian under represented
  - Regional fora - NO
    - Programmatic focus
    - Not standardised
    - A lot of feedback as a result of cross regional exchange
    - Loss to the Board, who would be unlikely to attend
  - Regional Fora leading to a global forum - NO
    - Would encourage a standardisation of regional meeting agendas
    - Fewer people involved on a global level
    - More activity required from the secretariat and greater expense
  - Linking it to other meetings - MAYBE
    - RBM, Stop TB, PEPFAR
    - Doesn't save that much money
    - Minimally more efficient

# Independent evaluation Recommendations

- YES - the PF should continue
  - PF an important part of the GF identity
    - Should remain as a formal part of the governance structure
    - Not a decision making body; it is advisory to the Board
    - Benefits are reputational
    - Records willingness to look at ideas such as “exit strategies”. Important for the Fund.
  - Role of PF will change as GF evolves
    - Should reconvene in 2 years
    - Maybe longer interval once GF is more stable
    - Maximise potential sources of value
    - Important to communicate feedback to all stakeholders
    - Board members should attend whole Forum
  - Improvement on PF 1
    - Invitation process needs to be better
      - Selection of participants
      - Timely invitations
    - Technical partners (WHO, Stop TB, RBM, UNAIDS, World Bank) did not attend at high level
    - Not much media attention – opportunity should have been used better

# Budget

	Budget	Actual	Variance
e-Forum	97,577.00	97,577.00	0.00
Media Event	25,000.00	31,379.00	6,379.00
Venue & Catering	67,100.00	69,800.00	2,700.00
Interpreters	89,371.00	89,371.00	0.00
Technical & Decoration	70,000.00	45,089.00	-24,911.00
Lead Facilitator	37,576.00	14,000.00	-23,576.00
Funded Participants (178 pax)	605,000.00	532,380.00	-72,620.00
Other miscellaneous expenses	30,000.00	19,677.00	-10,323.00
<b>TOTAL US\$</b>	<b>1,021,624.00</b>	<b>899,273.00</b>	<b>-122,351.00</b>

**Plus approximately \$225,000 donated funds**

# Secretariat Feedback

- Opportunity to interact with different stakeholders
- Risk mitigation factor
  - Building buy-in and acceptance of GF Policy and strategy
- Civil Society global exchange of information
  - eg. Zambia model of multiple PRs
- Secretariat team stretched to the limit
  - Need to involve more people in the secretariat
  - Felt that they were a wasted resource at the PF
  - Frustration with not being able to participate in a leading role
    - Need to take better advantage of the secretariat resource
  - Some facilitators not experienced enough
    - Covered only costs; did not pay for time of facilitators – should pay
  - Need skilled rapporteurs (in place of facilitators doing it)
- Differentiate from regional meetings
  - Different purpose
- E-Forum very successful

# Secretariat feedback

- Must have more time for preparation
- Must develop a timeline for planning with critical milestones
- Would like to have greater involvement of the Secretariat operations in programme development
- Steering committee didn't make decisions fast enough
  - 14 meetings; same topics discussed over and over again
- Must have sufficient staff within the secretariat to cope with the organisation of various Global Fund meetings
  - Scheduling three major meetings adjacent to each other placed huge demands on Secretariat staff
- Approx 700 invitations translated to 500 acceptances – right number
- Secretariat needs to have better communication materials
  - Base package to support the conversation
- Secretariat feels strongly that PF should continue

# Secretariat feedback

- Need more interpretation
  - Different models; personal interpreters
  - Session mismatch
- Could have made better use of media
  - As participants
  - Disappointed with media strategy (PFSC comment)
- Big visa problem; expediting visas not always easy
  - Bear this in mind for next meeting
  - Should not confine PF hosting to recipient countries alone
  - Need to develop criteria for hosting
- Start early, start early, start early
- Conduct replenishment and PF in alternate years

# PFSC recommendation for PF 2008

- Hold the 3<sup>rd</sup> Partnership Forum in 2008
- Similar format and duration
  - Learn from accumulated experience
  - Develop an engaging and forward looking theme
- Start earlier – mandate from the Board November 2006
  - Develop a timeline with critical decision points
  - PSC to mandate a PFSC early in 2007
- Properly resourced, sufficient staff and budget
  - Recommend \$1,2 million + staff
- Same size participation
  - Address deficiencies in participant list
  - Seek greater attendance and attention from Board Members
- Repeat the e-Forum
- Focus on operational issues rather than strategic
  - OK for feedback on policy and specific strategic options



# Decision Point

- 1) The Board takes note of the Partnership Forum 2006 report and agrees to use the recommendations contained therein to inform ongoing strategic planning and management of the Global Fund
- 2) The Board agrees to hold the third Partnership Forum in 2008 and mandates the PSC to convene a Partnership Forum Steering Committee to start planning for this event early in 2007.
- 3) The format and duration of the Third Partnership Forum should build on the lessons learned from previous Partnership Fora.
- 4) The Board approves a budget of \$1.2 million as an upper limit for the Third Partnership Forum and requests the Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) to ensure that provision is made for appropriate secretariat staffing levels in the 2007 and 2008 budgets.