

Meeting Report

55th Board Meeting

55th Board Meeting
9 - 10 July 2026

For Board Decision

Purpose

This document presents the Report of the 55th Global Fund Board Meeting, held in person in Geneva, Switzerland from 9 to 10 July 2026.

Agenda items: The Meeting comprised of eleven (11) agenda items. The Board held two (2) executive sessions.

Decisions: The Report includes a full record of the four (4) Decision Points adopted by the Board (Annex 1).

Glossary: A glossary of acronyms can be found in Annex 3.

Decision

The Report of the 55th Board Meeting was approved by the Board of the Global Fund via electronic vote on 08 October 2026 (GF/B55/EDP04).

Report

01. Opening

1. The Board convened in Geneva, Switzerland on 9 -10 July 2026 for the 55th Global Fund Board Meeting. The Board Meeting was preceded by a Board Retreat on 6-7 July, constituency meetings, and a panel discussion on the global health architecture. Quorum was confirmed on all official meeting days. The Chair of the Board, Lady Roslyn Morauta, along with Vice-Chair Advocate Bience Gawanas, welcomed participants and guests, including new Board Members and Alternates and participants joining virtually.
2. The Ethics Officer, Michelle Beistle, sought declarations of interest at the start of the meeting. Some Board members declared their interest considering the different topics on the agenda. The Ethics Officer confirmed that these declarations did not require the relevant Board participants to recuse themselves from discussions or decision making.

Opening remarks

3. In her opening remarks, the Board Chair welcomed new Board and Alternate Board Members including from the newly established Japan/Republic of Korea Constituency. The Chair also acknowledged the incoming Board Chair and Vice-Chair, Erna Solberg and Javier Hourcade Bellocq, who attended as observers ahead of assuming their roles at the 56th Board meeting in October 2026.
4. The Board Chair reflected on the Board Retreat, thanking Board Members for their candid, constructive engagement on a range of complex issues faced by the Global Fund. The Retreat was intended as a forum for dialogue and reflection rather than decision-making, and a space for strategic dialogue providing a foundation for ongoing work through Board and Standing Committee processes. The Retreat focused on the context of an evolving global health and financing landscape, explored the Global Fund's core strengths and values, reflected on the evolution of the organization, and looked ahead to future choices and to how the model may adapt, from integration and country ownership to access to innovation, differentiation across country contexts, and the wider reform of the ecosystem. Directional steer was drawn by the Secretariat from the Board Retreat; however, in several areas, the discussion did not yet constitute alignment. The discussion on governance enabled reflection on the role of the Board to carry this work forward.
5. The Chair highlighted the key meeting agenda items before the Board, including decisions on the Evolution of the Risk Appetite Framework and Non-Global Fund Financed Procurement Policy and Financial Mechanism (NGFP), as well as discussions on Grant Cycle 8 (GC8), the approach to evidence and learning, governance effectiveness, and the Global Fund's role within the changing global health architecture. The Chair underscored that, taken together, these discussions go to the heart of the Board's responsibility to address difficult issues with honesty, govern effectively, and leave the 55th Board Meeting confident in a strong Global Fund model that can continue to deliver impact for the communities it serves.
6. The traditional candle of remembrance was lit by Aishath Samiya, Alternate Board Member for the South East Asia Constituency. Aishath Samiya emphasized that Board decisions on allocations, policies, and governance arrangements have direct consequences for country programs and the millions of people affected by HIV, tuberculosis (TB), and malaria, the sustainability of country

programs, and the ability of grant implementers to deliver services. The intervention concluded with a moment of reflection, honoring those who have died from these diseases and recognizing the individuals who continue to rely on the Global Fund's work and the Board's stewardship.

Decisions

7. **Decision points.** The Board unanimously approved the decisions to adopt the agenda of the 55th Board meeting (GF/B55/DP01) and to appoint Aishath Samiya of the South East Asia Constituency as rapporteur (GF/B55/DP02).

02. Update by the Executive Director

Presentation

8. The Executive Director (ED) emphasized the exceptionally demanding first half of 2026, given the final year of Grant Cycle 7 (GC7), the preparation of Grant Cycle 8 (GC8) funding requests under compressed timelines, and the phase-out of the COVID-19 Response Mechanism (C19RM). All being undertaken while navigating impacts of the changing global health funding landscape and multiple disruptive events, including geopolitical conflicts, disease outbreaks, and climate-related emergencies. Despite the challenges, the ED noted that GC7 absorption reached its highest level at this stage in the grant cycle following intense focus on cost-effective execution of the final year of GC7.
9. The GC8 funding request process is proceeding within truncated timelines compared to GC7, with explicit transition timelines, differentiated funding request processes, and simplification efforts, with a significant reduction in guidance materials and funding request annexes. Funding Requests submitted in window one, representing one third of the portfolio, were of good quality and aligned to the strategic shifts and all recommended by the Technical Review Panel (TRP) for grant making. The Funding Requests in this window indicate an intensified commitment to integrating HIV, TB, and malaria programs with Primary Health Care (PHC), sustained attention to community systems, and continued focus on tackling human rights and gender barriers to accessing health services. Direct RSSH investments have also increased slightly.
10. The ED highlighted the power of innovation as one of the most important opportunities to offset funding constraints and accelerate progress against the three diseases. The rollout of Lenacapavir is gaining pace, and in-country deliveries are in progress for Artificial Intelligence (AI)-enabled digital X-ray screening and new near-patient molecular diagnostics (NPOC) for TB, as well as deployment of emerging vector-control tools for malaria, such as spatial emanators. The ED emphasized the critical need to mobilize additional resources and leverage philanthropic capital to support these transformational innovations.
11. Priorities for the remainder of 2026 include launching GC8 on time with quality grants, supporting countries through planned transition timelines, driving a more ambitious HIV prevention agenda, improving TB case detection, mobilizing additional resources for malaria, and further strengthening procurement and market-shaping efforts. The Global Fund will continue to engage in broader global health reform discussions, including the World Health Organization (WHO)-led process and Accra Reset, while navigating significant leadership transitions and driving further transformation of the Secretariat.
12. The ED acknowledged the significant pressures facing the Secretariat, implementing countries, civil society organizations, and affected communities, while expressing confidence in the partnership's

ability to adapt, innovate, and deliver impact. The ED concluded by thanking the Board, Secretariat staff, partners, and frontline health workers for their commitment and work during a highly challenging period.

Board discussion

13. The Board expressed widespread appreciation to the ED, Secretariat and broader partnership and raised the following points:
- a. **Transition and Protecting Vulnerable Populations, Human Rights, and Communities:** Transition was a core theme across the Board discussion with several constituencies emphasizing the importance of managing transitions and monitoring risks carefully to avoid backsliding and disease resurgence, particularly among key and vulnerable populations. Some constituencies expressed concern about countries transitioning out of Global Fund support in GC8 before they are ready and called for differentiated approaches for Global Fund support, recognizing that countries face very different epidemiological, economic, and political realities. There were comments on how funding constraints, shrinking civic space, and discriminatory laws are disproportionately affecting communities and key populations. It was cautioned that this may result in communities being excluded from engagement in national disease responses.
 - b. **Resource Mobilization and Health Financing:** Several constituencies focused on the impact of funding cuts on countries and communities, and the need for countries to increase domestic health investments. One constituency emphasized the critical role of taxation to build sustainable health systems. Another noted the potential for increased contributions from private philanthropic organizations and high-net-worth individuals, and the need to be responsive to these opportunities given the Global Fund's ability to scale quickly with impact, emphasizing that this funding complements rather than replaces other funding sources.
 - c. **Global Health Architecture (GHA):** A common theme was the need for the Global Fund to evolve its operating model in response to declining funds, changing donor dynamics, and broader reforms in the global health architecture. The Board welcomed the Secretariat's engagement in broader reform processes, including WHO reform and the Accra Reset, and called for deeper collaboration with other entities (e.g. Gavi and other partners).
 - d. **Innovation.** Multiple constituencies praised the progress being made on Lenacapavir, noting the importance of ambitious deployment targets. Some Board Members emphasized the Global Fund's unique role in market shaping, increasing access to affordable health technologies, and accelerating adoption of innovations.
 - e. **Organizational Effectiveness and Governance Reform.** Constituencies welcomed the simplification efforts implemented for the GC8 funding request process. The need for more strategic and efficient governance was stressed, including clearer Board focus on major trade-offs and strategic choices. At the same time, there were warnings against over-simplifying governance structures in ways that could weaken the partnership model, stakeholder representation, accountability, or the Global Fund's ability to respond flexibly to emerging challenges.

Response by the Executive Director

14. The ED thanked the Board for its comments and appreciation of the work of the Secretariat, and made the following final remarks:
- a. **Transition and Protecting Vulnerable Populations, Human Rights, and Communities:** The ED recognized the significant challenges facing countries in transition, effective transition

requires political will to mobilize resources, recognize the role of communities, and address the underlying drivers of disease such as injectable drug use for HIV. At the other end of the spectrum, there is an immense challenge posed by the increasing number of countries facing protracted crises due to conflict, climate change and political failure, blurring the distinction between humanitarian and developmental assistance, which will require the Board to make difficult strategic choices going forward.

- b. **Resource Mobilization and Health Financing:** The ED agreed that sustainable health financing begins with domestic resource mobilization and taxation. However, the Global Fund's role is to support public financial management and health budgeting rather than engaging directly in broader fiscal reforms.
- c. **Global Health Architecture:** The Secretariat will remain actively engaged in key global health reform processes, particularly the WHO-led process and the Accra Reset, and deepen collaboration with other entities, including Gavi. However, the ED cautioned that goodwill and coordination alone will not be sufficient and that structural changes, including potential consolidation of governance arrangements, may be required.
- d. **Innovation:** The ED reaffirmed the importance of new tools such as Lenacapavir and future TB and malaria innovations yet stressed that countries need support to optimize the use of all available interventions. Moreover, rapid progress in innovation, procurement, and market shaping, achieved through partnerships with organizations such as WHO, UNITAID, foundations, and governments should always be judged by their contribution to improved health outcomes.
- e. **Organizational Effectiveness and Governance Reform:** The ED reiterated efforts in GC8 to simplify the funding request process and reporting requirements. Moving forward, Board discussions will need to focus on strategic prioritization and difficult choices regarding where the Global Fund directs its limited resources and attention to maximize impact.

03.Risk Management Report and Annual Opinion and Adjustments to Risk Appetite Statements

Presentation

- 15. The Board Chair outlined the two session objectives, to present the Risk Management Report and 2025 Annual Opinion and to approve the revised Risk Appetite Framework and statements for Programmatic Outcomes, Health Product Access, and Finance and Fiduciary Risk. The Board was encouraged to consider whether the adjustments guide management appropriately and balance ambition, accountability, and prudent stewardship.
- 16. The Ethics Officer / Chief Risk Officer (CRO) provided an overview of the current Global Fund's risk profile and outlook to set the context for the risk appetite decision. Risk management is a shared responsibility across the partnership. While the organization remains institutionally strong and credible, the operating environment has deteriorated significantly, with its risk profile elevated and trending upward. This reflects the interaction between funding uncertainty, constrained organizational capacity, top leadership transition, and strategic ambitions that remain high relative to available resources. The organization must strike a difficult balance between ambition and sustainable delivery within existing constraints, and these risks require clear Board steer on priorities, risk acceptance, and the trade-offs involved to be addressed effectively.
- 17. The revised Risk Appetite Framework was developed drawing on OIG advisory work, peer

benchmarking, and extensive stakeholder engagement. The Framework (i) introduces a three-level risk taxonomy, with enterprise risks overseen by the Board, organizational risks under management purview, and day-to-day risks managed by Secretariat business owners, and (ii) shifts from residual risk measurement to a qualitative, decision-oriented approach expressed through four stances: averse, cautious, tolerant, and aggressive. The Board was asked to consider a tolerant stance for programmatic and health product access risks, and a cautious stance for financial and fiduciary risk, respectively.

Board discussion

18. The AFC Vice-Chair provided a readout of the Committee discussions on risk noting it (i) unanimously recommended the revised Framework and Statements for Board approval, and (ii) welcomed the clearer taxonomy, the shift to a decision-oriented approach, and the clearer delineation of governance responsibilities between the Board and management.
19. Board members broadly welcomed the revised Framework and expressed strong support for the proposed Statements. Board members raised the following points:
 - a. **Prioritization and trade-offs:** Several Board members emphasized that the Framework's value lies in its ability to support clearer prioritization, deliberate trade-offs and concentration of resources where they matter most and welcomed the Secretariat's recognition that accepting greater risk does not mean accepting poorer outcomes. While the Board can add priorities, organizational effectiveness will require greater discipline in deciding what to deprioritize or stop. It was stressed that the ambition, resources and capacity of the organization are not currently aligned. Hence when considering new initiatives, the Board should also advise on what to stop. One member noted that accepting higher implementation risk in a constrained environment requires willingness to deprioritize, and sought clarity on how the Board can better support operationalization of the Framework.
 - b. **Transition risk, community systems and vulnerable populations:** Transition risk was a core theme, noting its complexity encompassing a wide range of interconnected risks, including supply chain, financial, legal and community. Several members emphasized that preparing for transition is about financing, as well as ensuring health and community systems, and civil society have the capacity and sustained investment to maintain equitable access. It was stressed that Community, Rights and Gender interventions require attention given their vulnerability in reduced-funding contexts. There were calls for a clear escalation path to protect community systems strengthening, and for co-financing requirements across donors to be approached holistically, recognizing the cumulative burden on countries.
 - c. **Operationalization, escalation and country-level differentiation:** Several members emphasized that the translation of Board-approved appetite into day-to-day operational risk positions will determine whether the Framework delivers its intended value. Members also requested greater clarity, including practical examples, on how the approved risk appetite would inform operational decision-making. Risk appetite is directly linked to governance effectiveness, requiring clear escalation pathways and ongoing monitoring and Board visibility into management-level risk positions. Some members requested risk positions for programmatic and health product access risks to be shared with the Board before these take effect. Several members highlighted the importance of differentiated implementation, particularly between challenging operating environments (COE) and non-COE countries, and inquired how the Framework will ensure differentiated approaches.
 - d. **Quantitative indicators and reporting:** Some members encouraged complementing the qualitative approach with quantitative thresholds and risk indicators, noting that different stakeholders may interpret the same risk appetite definition in different ways. Several members welcomed the introduction of leading risk indicators and early warning triggers, and called for a

risk dashboard presenting risk trends, residual risk and mitigation progress. One member noted that while understanding the phased approach, presenting three of the six enterprise risk appetite statements makes the overall risk picture and therefore decision incomplete, given the interconnected nature of risks. There were questions about where digital health and AI-related risks would be incorporated.

Secretariat response

20. The Secretariat provided the following responses and clarifications:

- a. **Prioritization, trade-offs:** risk appetite is a decision-making tool rather than a decision in itself, with the Board setting a tolerance level for management and the Secretariat staff to take into consideration as they make decisions at country level and on market shaping, finance, fiduciary matters, and across all operational areas. Currently the Global Fund operates within a risk tolerance that is implied rather than firmly stated. The risk appetite provides the Secretariat with the confidence to focus resources and effort on priority areas, enabling targeted action that will have the greatest impact on advancing the mission.
- b. **Transition risk, community systems and vulnerable populations:** Transition risk—including its impact on communities, efforts to break down access barriers, and market-shaping objectives—remains a key area of focus. Country Teams are actively managing this risk, seeking to operate within established tolerance levels while appropriately taking on greater risk in areas critical to achieving impact. On community systems, programmatic risk explicitly includes CRG, RSSH, and community systems as core programmatic risk categories at management level. For quality assurance, while the overall health product access appetite is tolerant it is maintained at a cautious stance as a specific indicator beneath the enterprise level. The transition risk is reflected in the definition of the programmatic risk statement and will be reported to the Board as part of ongoing risk monitoring.
- c. **Operationalization, escalation and country-level differentiation:** Operationalization of the risk framework is already underway, with senior management and their teams identifying Secretariat-level risks for each business area, defining escalation triggers to management-level, and establishing indicators to be rolled up into broader tolerance reporting for Committees and the Board. This reporting will provide visibility on escalations, areas going out of tolerance, and the Secretariat's response. The Board will receive a pre-view of risk positions ahead of their finalization, with continued Committees and the Board visibility on management level risk positions. On differentiated implementation, context-specific application, including for COEs, is a core feature of the Framework.
- d. **Quantitative indicators and reporting:** The remaining three enterprise risk appetite statements, will be brought to the relevant Committees and the Board in October 2026. Digital health and AI aspects fall within the Secretariat Operations risk category and will be addressed in the next set of statements. The effectiveness of the Framework will be assessed through monitoring of implementation and impact, by tracking whether the risk positions taken are enabling the Secretariat to move towards achieving the Global Fund mission.

Decision and next steps

21. **Decision point.** The Board unanimously approved the decision point GF/B55/DP03 on the revised Risk Appetite Framework and Risk Appetite Statements for Programmatic Risk, Health Product Access Risk and Financial and Fiduciary Risk.
22. The Board Chair closed the discussion by thanking Board members for their substantive engagement. The Secretariat confirmed it will bring to the relevant Committees and the Board the remaining three enterprise risk appetite statements at the October 2026 meetings.

04. Grant Cycle 2027 – 2029 Strategy Costing

Presentation

23. The Board Chair opened the session by inviting Board members' input and steer ahead of the Board's decision on the 2027 OPEX budget in October 2026. The discussion was structured around (i) understanding the structural OPEX challenge and considering a credible pathway to close it; and (ii) reviewing the key risks, levers, and trade-offs involved.
24. The Secretariat explained that GC8 must be delivered within the approved US\$930 million OPEX aggregate forecast. Compared with GC7, this represents a cycle-on-cycle OPEX gap of approximately US\$230 million, reflecting both a lower approved envelope for GC8 and significant foreign exchange pressures linked to a cost base largely denominated in Swiss francs. The Secretariat noted that measures already identified would cover approximately 55% of the gap, but that around 45% remains to be addressed. Closing the remaining gap will require a further reduction of approximately US\$60 million from the cost base, in addition to reductions and efficiencies already undertaken, while continuing to manage the associated risks and trade-offs transparently with the Board.
25. The Secretariat presented a proposed two-track response to address the structural OPEX challenge. Track One focuses on near-term measures that are largely non-workforce related, including the proposed realignment of CCM funding from OPEX to the Asset Liability Management (ALM) balance. This represents a reclassification of the funding source, while preserving CCM funding levels, safeguarding CCM independence, and providing greater multi-year funding predictability for CCMs. Track Two is intended to address the remaining gap through a structural transformation of the operating model, including greater differentiation in country support and the optimization of enabling functions. Any proposed measure deemed to pose an unacceptable risk to operations or to the achievement of the Global Fund's mission would be escalated to the Board for consideration.

Board discussion

26. The AFC Chair provided a readout of its discussions during the Committee's meeting in May 2026 and through the established informal OPEX Working Group, formed by AFC members and one SC member. There is broad AFC support for the two-track methodology and consistent emphasis on rigorous prioritization, protection of delivery capacity, and clear communication of trade-offs.
27. During the discussion that followed Board members raised the following points:
- CCM realignment and ALM risk:** Several members sought clarification on whether (i) transferring CCM funding to the ALM would expose it to fluctuations in the ALM balance and make its long-term stability contingent on broader financial performance, and (ii) whether the CCM budget line would be the first to absorb pressure if the ALM came under strain. One member asked whether the reclassification is a permanent structural change or one-off measure for the GC8, and requested assurance on the long-term resilience of the approach. In relation to the CCM discussion, one member called for a dedicated Board session on the future role of CCMs, while several others raised related concerns about the stability, predictability, and protection of CCM funding under the proposed ALM realignment.
 - Workforce capacity, specialised expertise:** Several members expressed concern that reductions in specialized Secretariat staff capacity could directly affect the quality of GC8 shifts

implementation, and emphasized the need to maintain technical and strategic expertise. One constituency requested to develop a strategic workforce plan that helps the Board understand Track 2's functional review and the trade-offs that come from it.

- c. **Differentiated country support:** Some members asked questions about how differentiated country support, accounting for burden, capacity, and economics would be operationalized. Some constituencies stressed that communities and civil society must remain at the centre of the mission regardless of how support models are restructured, and called for explicit protections for fragile and conflict-affected settings in the transformation plan.
- d. **In-country oversight assurance and governance efficiency:** Some members expressed reservations about reductions to the LFA budget, arguing that in-country oversight is essential and cuts may exceed acceptable risk tolerance. One member called for a bottom-up budgeting approach and proposed a specific review of the cost of governance, including meetings, retreats, and travel, as part of the 2027 OPEX preparation process.
- e. **Strategic direction and Board engagement and oversight:** Several members confirmed support for the two-track approach while calling for continued rigorous assessment of all possible efficiencies. Some constituencies emphasised the need for greater Board and Committee engagement throughout the process, given the strategic programmatic implications for delivering on comparative advantages or partner dependencies in an evolving external environment. Members welcomed the 2028-2029 ALM checkpoint as an orderly mechanism for revisiting OPEX should further adjustments be needed ahead of the next strategy period and called for sufficient flexibility to be built into the 2029 planning horizon – with one constituency stating the OPEX should not drive the next strategy. One member stressed that any changes to strategic KPIs should be supported by transparent governance processes, and encouraged the Secretariat to capture and share best practices from countries successfully strengthening domestic financing while sustaining program performance

Secretariat response

28. The Secretariat provided the following responses and clarifications:

- a. **CCM realignment and ALM risk:** CCM funding will become a separate allocation within the ALM. The reclassification strengthens protection by establishing a dedicated funding allocation with greater multi-year visibility, enabling the Board to prioritize CCM funding explicitly within future replenishment decisions. Future replenishment discussions will include an explicit prioritization of country allocation, OPEX, CCM, and catalytic investment as separate line items. The Board will be engaged on the strategic positioning of CCMs at an appropriate future session.
- b. **Workforce capacity and specialised expertise:** The Secretariat functional review is designed to determine what is necessary to deliver on the mission, grounded in country realities and GC8 strategic shifts.
- c. **Differentiated country support:** Differentiation of support by country burden, capacity and economics is central to the transformation work, which will be developed further and brought back to Committees. Where reduced resources create risk to delivery in fragile or COE contexts this will be escalated. Communities and civil society remain at the core of the mission and will be protected accordingly as differentiated country support models.
- d. **In-country oversight assurance and governance efficiency:** The proposed LFA reductions are progressive optimization, with resources concentrated in high-risk portfolios and COEs, while LFA interventions will be reduced in countries with stronger public financial management (PFM) maturity. This involves risk acceptance, and ongoing monitoring and escalating if assurance quality is affected. Elaboration on governance costs will be shared and considered as part of the 2027 OPEX budget preparation. The Secretariat will also seek input from the SC on strategic aspects, including as part of discussions on what to prioritize and when.
- e. **Strategic direction and Board engagement and oversight:** Pledge conversion is monitored

monthly and reviewed quarterly through the ALM committee and AFC reporting. Any developments affecting the viability of the pathways will be escalated through the AFC promptly

Conclusions and next steps

29. The Board Chair confirmed the sequence of next steps: the OPEX Working Group will meet twice more in July and August; in the October committees, the Strategy Committee will consider strategic direction and trade-offs; the AFC will consider its recommendation on the 2027 OPEX budget in mid-October; and the Board will be asked to approve the 2027 OPEX budget at its next 56th meeting.

05.NextGen Market Shaping and Non-Global Fund Financed Procurement

Presentation

30. The Board Chair introduced the two procurement-related items to be discussed: (i) the Annual Procurement and Market Shaping Report for Board input; and (ii) the Non-Global Fund-Financed Procurement (NGFP) Policy and Financial Mechanism, presented for Board decision following joint recommendation by the SC and AFC. The Chair also informed the Board that an amendment to the decision point had been submitted through the formal amendment process.
31. The Secretariat highlighted that procurement through the Pooled Procurement Mechanism (PPM)/wambo.org and NextGen Market Shaping approach continue to represent a significant operational and strategic function for the Global Fund; in 2025, approximately 80 countries procured over US\$1 billion of health products. The Secretariat noted challenges related to supply chain volatility, foreign exchange movements, geopolitical disruption, and resource constraints.
32. On the evolution of the NGFP, the Secretariat presented the Policy on NGFP through PPM/wambo.org, including the enabling Financial Management framework, including both pre-paid and pre-financing modalities, the former of which carries no credit risk exposure to the Global Fund. The Secretariat noted that while NGFP is already available to countries, the proposal consolidates existing Board decisions into a single policy, clarifying aspects related to buyer-payer roles, expanding the definition of eligible buyers, establishing a segregated financial mechanism (including a pre-financing facility), and establishing a cost recovery fee framework. The proposed evolution intends to support countries in transition and country-led procurement models, strengthen value for money, manage downstream procurement risks, and complement regional and national procurement platforms. The proposal is situated within the broader operating context of increasing fiscal constraints, evolving country transition needs, domestic resource mobilization, and the need to preserve access to quality-assured, affordable health products in line with the enhanced value for money framework.

Board discussion

33. The SC Chair reported that, while the SC had unanimously recommended the policy to the Board at its May 2026 meeting, further clarification was requested on the operational framework, governance, guardrails related to risk management and reporting mechanisms. Consistent with this feedback, the France, Germany, UK, European Commission, Belgium, Italy, Portugal and Spain and Point Seven constituencies proposed an amendment to the decision point directing the

Secretariat to return to the SC with more details of the safeguards to achieve value for money, and to mitigate associated risks around market distortion and supplier concentration. The AFC Chair confirmed that AFC had also recommended approval of the NGFP Policy and Financial Mechanism at its May 2026 meeting following discussion of financial risk management, governance, cost recovery, the pre-financing facility, and segregated financial arrangements.

34. During the discussion that followed, the Board raised the following issues:

- a. **NGFP Policy and financial mechanism:** The Board expressed strong support for the proposed NGFP policy and the related financial management framework, viewing it as a strategic evolution of an existing Global Fund capability with potential to support transition, domestic financing, access to innovation, value for money, and continued availability of quality-assured health products beyond grant financing. Some members noted that clear criteria, safeguards and transparency for the pre-financing facility would be important, with some seeking clarity on the cost-recovery model, including fee calculations and how fees might affect affordability for lower-income and transitioning countries. Several members requested further information on the operationalization of the mechanism and the implications for Secretariat capacity in a constrained OPEX environment.
- b. **Governance, oversight and reporting:** A core theme of the discussion was governance and oversight. Members emphasized that the scale, complexity and growing strategic importance of Global Fund's procurement and market shaping activities, as well as their technical nature, require strengthened Board oversight. Members noted that more detailed analysis would be helpful on value for money to understand how procurement offers to countries are continuously assessed and optimized both for product costs and the total cost of delivery, including: (i) carefully assessing supply chain costing and performance metrics and benchmarking. Some members requested disaggregated reporting and transparency on requests and approvals for pre-financing and supply-constrained products. Several constituencies supported consideration by the Coordinating Group (CG) of a right-sized advisory, technical or cross-committee mechanism with relevant expertise to strengthen strategic and risk oversight. Others cautioned that any additional governance requirements should be balanced against the Secretariat's capacity.
- c. **Market shaping:** Some members asked about risk mitigation measures to avoid pricing distortions as pooled procurement is expanded through NGFP. Members requested safeguards to protect competition, avoid supplier concentration and ensure that buyer preferences do not undermine market access, affordability, or regional and national procurement systems.
- d. **Innovations and supply-constrained products:** Some members sought greater clarity on how innovative or supply-constrained products would be allocated fairly when demand exceeds supply. Members emphasized that quality assurance requirements should remain firm. Several members also raised concerns regarding supply forecasting, failed tenders, stockouts, and coordination with partners and major procurers, including with GDF for TB products and diagnostics, to avoid fragmentation and preserve continuity of supply.
- e. **Regional manufacturing and procurement:** Regional manufacturing was a major area of emphasis across constituencies. Members welcomed current efforts but called for clearer reporting on procurement from African manufacturers. Several members requested explicit targets or benchmarks, including annual reporting to assess progress, while others asked for clarity on how incentives for regional manufacturing would be balanced with quality assurance, affordability, competition, and supply security. Several members stressed that NGFP should complement regional and national procurement platforms, and requested further clarity on transition pathways and collaboration with existing pooled procurement mechanisms.
- f. **Equity and access:** Some members emphasized that the mechanism should support equity and access, particularly for lower-income, high-burden, transitioning, and transitioned countries, as well as small island developing states and countries with limited procurement capacity or

higher operational costs. Members also highlighted the need to integrate procurement planning into sustainability and transition planning, national budgets and country-led systems, while ensuring continued engagement with communities and civil society actors involved in procurement and delivery at country level.

Secretariat response

35. The Secretariat provided the following responses and clarifications:

- a. **NGFP Policy and financial mechanism:** The Secretariat is aiming for a mechanism that can be implemented in an agile and adaptive manner, with learning documented throughout implementation. The Secretariat noted that catalytic investment and bilateral support may support start-up needs. The pre-financing facility is intended for countries facing the largest barriers to prepayment and that prioritization would be informed by demand analysis, country need, and ability to pay. Pre-financing facility support is intended to be modest given the existence of other mechanisms. NGFP is structured to be managed as a segregated special-purpose mechanism, with dedicated governance, assurance, reporting, and separate financial statements subject to audit. The cost recovery model is intended to be modest to cover the operating expenses so as not to create pressure on OPEX and will integrate lessons learned from the COVID-19 Response Mechanism. Country-level barriers that are non-financial in nature are also important to address. There is ongoing partnership work with the World Bank and other pooled procurement mechanisms to address this.
- b. **Governance, oversight, and reporting:** The Secretariat noted that there are plans to enhance the value for money framework in the near future. On requests for enhanced reporting, the Secretariat acknowledged that insights from further reporting would inform and be relevant to NGFP and the broader PPM/wambo.org platform. The Secretariat will reflect further on how to engage the Board and Committees in a manner that supports governance oversight without creating a disproportionate burden. A 24-month review was proposed to allow sufficient time for both policy and financial review, including audit evidence.
- c. **Regional manufacturing and procurement:** The NGFP is a complementary and potentially catalytic mechanism to advance regional manufacturing, including by enabling manufacturers to be accessed through multiple procurement platforms. Discussions will continue with regional, continental and national procurement mechanisms, including how to leverage such platforms as part of sustainability and transition pathways.
- d. **Market shaping:** While NGFP eligibility criteria are defined, further work will refine buyers' preferences and criteria for prioritizing country requests where this is necessary. Buyer preferences are limited to those set out in the Board paper; any additional preferences outside those parameters would require SC and Board review and approval.

Decision and next steps

36. **Decision point.** The Board unanimously approved the decision point GF/B55/DP04: Non-Global Fund-Financed Procurement Policy and Financial Mechanism.
37. The Secretariat will return to the SC in October 2026 with a further articulation of the safeguards to be established within the operational framework to achieve value for money, protect against market distortion and supplier concentration, and support effective oversight and reporting on implementation and associated risks for SC input. The CG will review the requests for greater governance oversight and report back on how future discussions will be incorporated into governance work plans of the appropriate committees and Board.

06.Executive Director Nomination Committee Progress Update

Presentation

38. The Board received the third progress update from the Executive Director Nomination Committee (EDNC) on the ongoing Executive Director selection process. The EDNC Leadership reported that the process is on track, outlining milestones concluded, including candidate outreach and a rigorous shortlisting exercise based on Board-approved competencies. EDNC Leadership recalled the committee's agreement to undertake limited additional outreach to strengthen regional diversity of the candidate pool, confirming that a second shortlisting exercise had now concluded, with all candidates assessed against the same competency framework and held to the same due diligence standards.
39. The EDNC Leadership expressed confidence in the quality and diversity of the candidate pool, and in the integrity of the process, which has been independent, merit-based, and conducted with strict confidentiality, noting the importance of confidentiality to attracting and retaining high caliber candidates. The lead representative of the search firm, Russell Reynolds Associates, shared reflections with the Board, describing the process as robust, and underlining that the structured merit-based process, confidentiality, and predictability remain critical to maintaining candidate confidence in support of reaching the strongest possible final shortlist for Board consideration. The EDNC Chair recalled that current strict confidentiality through the short-listing phase is balanced with increased transparency in the later Board-level stages.
40. The EDNC Leadership recalled the next stages of the process, including interviews in two rounds, further due diligence and psychometric assessments, after which the EDNC will put forward a final shortlist of four to five candidates to the Board, concluding the work of the committee. The process will then move to its Board-level stage under the stewardship of the Board Leadership, including a Board Retreat, a constituency engagement period in October, and the final appointment decision at the beginning of the 56th Board Meeting.
41. The Vice-Chair of the Board provided an overview of the constituency engagement phase planned for October 2026, which aims to support internal constituency consultations; allow constituency members beyond Board Members and Alternates to engage with the final shortlisted candidates; and allow candidates to gain a deeper understanding of partnership priorities and constituency perspectives.

Board discussion

42. The EGC Leadership confirmed that the EGC has received regular updates, remains assured that the process is progressing as planned, and continues to provide governance oversight in support of a successful ED appointment.
43. During the discussion that followed, the Board raised the following:
 - a. **Selection process:** Board members welcomed the progress update and expressed confidence in and support for the integrity of the ED selection process. Several members underscored the importance of a fair, merit-based process that promotes strong regional and gender diversity. Support was expressed for the additional outreach conducted to strengthen regional representation.
 - b. **Board engagement:** Several members sought further clarity on the modalities for the upcoming

Board retreat and constituency engagement phase. Some noted the need to balance confidentiality with sufficient transparency to support informed decision-making, and sought clarifications on when the final shortlisted candidate names would be made public.

- c. **Executive Director profile:** Members shared insights on the profile of the next Executive Director, highlighting the importance of selecting a leader who can navigate a changing global health landscape while upholding the Global Fund's core principles, continuing to build on the impressive progress to date. Some members emphasized the importance of community engagement experience.
- d. **Leadership continuity and transition:** Some members emphasized the need for continuity, stability, and effective leadership during a period of change and complexity. Questions of clarification were raised regarding the leadership transition in Q1 2027.

EDNC Leadership Response

- 42. The EDNC Chair and Vice-Chair reaffirmed confidence in the integrity of the process and the quality of the candidate pool, affirming that the committee is working in line with the EDNC mandate. In line with the EDNC's Terms of Reference, regional and gender diversity were actively considered throughout shortlisting alongside competency requirements, with the additional outreach period supporting strengthened regional balance in the pool. EDNC Leadership also confirmed that the EDNC considers candidates' demonstration of ethical values and history with respect to key Global Fund strategic issues, including gender equality, key populations and communities, as provided in the EDNC Terms of Reference.

Secretariat response

- 43. The Secretariat shared additional insights into the Board Retreat at which Board Members and Alternates will meet in closed session with each of the final shortlisted candidates. The Secretariat further clarified that final shortlisted candidate names will remain confidential until shortly before the Board Retreat, at which point they will be made public. The constituency engagement phase is intended both to enable broader interaction between candidates and constituency delegations beyond Board Member and Alternates, and to support constituency consultations ahead of the final vote, through structured calls held with the search firm and candidate, with the opportunity to submit questions ahead of time. Further information on the modalities will be shared with the Board. Last, while the precise date of leadership transition will depend on the availability of the incoming appointee, the current ED has generously agreed to remain in post until end of Q1 2027, if needed, to support a smooth transition.

07. Governance Effectiveness

Presentation

- 44. The Board Vice Chair opened the session, stressing that strong governance is essential to the Global Fund's mission in an evolving context, and summarizing key themes from the Board Retreat. Retreat discussions demonstrated a strong sense of shared purpose, alongside recognition of the governance challenges and opportunities ahead. The Retreat recognized that governance is an enabler, with mission impact as its primary focus. Board members called for governance to remain focused, inclusive, and responsive to the needs of the partnership in a changing environment. Key priorities included prioritization and strategic focus, ensuring country and community voices are central to decision-making, and enabling agile decision-making with the ability to consider trade-offs. Trust, transparency, inclusiveness consultation, combined with high quality information, remain key, alongside clarity on governance roles and responsibilities. Overall, the Global Fund's

governance remains a strength and comparative advantage. The challenge ahead will be for governance to become increasingly focused, agile and action-oriented while preserving the inclusiveness and stakeholder engagement that have been fundamental to the Global Fund's success.

45. The Secretariat noted that the Global Fund is operating in an increasingly complex environment, characterized at once by change, funding constraints and architectural reform, and by innovation and opportunity. In this context, strong governance is more important than ever to help the partnership navigate difficult decisions through its multi-stakeholder model. This model is at once a significant strength, and inherently complex. The Secretariat highlighted evidence of growing strain on the governance system, including increasing demands on Board members' time, and rising governance costs. The main concern was not the cost itself, but the risk that growing volumes of meetings and information could undermine equitable participation, voice, and transparency. To address this, a range of near-term practical measures were presented, aimed at enabling focus on impact and reducing burden while safeguarding representation and voice, and navigating the tensions of inclusion and capacity constraints, consultation and agility, information, and overload. Practical proposals included strategic agendas, streamlining reporting, and strengthening clarity on roles and responsibilities. Longer-term considerations to adapt governance for the future were also introduced for initial reflection, including looking at structures and mandates, Board composition, and effective joint governance engagement.

Board discussion

46. The EGC Vice Chair provided a comprehensive summary of EGC inputs so far. At its 30th meeting, the EGC had reflected on governance risk and governance effectiveness, in an interactive discussion. The committee recognized that while the current governance model remains effective, it is facing increasing burden. The EGC Vice-Chair shared EGC inputs on the six near-term practical measures presented at the 30th EGC meeting in May 2026, noting that a seventh focus area on clarifying governance processes and roles had been added in response to themes emerging from the discussions. While EGC deliberations were not intended to be decisive, rich inputs were shared. The committee broadly supported more strategic agendas centered on high-impact, mission-critical issues, and streamlining reporting, ensuring that papers focus on risks, trade-offs, and decision-relevant information. The EGC encouraged more interactive discussions, and shared perspectives on how governance culture enables open debate, alongside views on consensus-building. The committee noted clarifying roles and responsibilities as an area for further reflection. There was support for finding ways to reduce the intensity of meeting demands while safeguarding meaningful engagement. Last, the EGC Vice-Chair noted EGC perspectives on delegation size, noting the need to return to this item. The Committee welcomed Board guidance on which governance improvements should be prioritized going forward.
47. During the discussion that followed, the Board raised the following points:
- a. **Support to reflect on governance change:** Board members welcomed the discussion and broadly supported the governance effectiveness efforts and direction of travel, agreeing that the Global Fund's governance model remains a major strength that brings together diverse actors, and expressing openness that the model should continue to evolve to meet a more complex environment. There was also interest in exploring longer-term issues such as joint governance arrangements with other global health institutions, Board composition, constituency representation, and how governance can evolve while protecting core multi-stakeholder principles.
 - b. **Preserving inclusiveness and voice.** Many members stressed that governance evolution must preserve inclusiveness, representation, and country voice. Measures should not be aimed at

improving efficiency alone, with cautions regarding the risk of unintentionally weakening participation by implementing countries and communities.

- c. **Evolving landscape.** Some members reflected on the need for governance to evolve in response to broader shifts in the global health landscape and increasing emphasis on country ownership, sovereignty, and regional leadership. Several members expressed support to look at Board composition, with calls to reflect on balance of voice including representation for implementing countries and the role of transitioning countries. A suggestion was shared to move swiftly in considering effective approaches to joint governance engagement.
- d. **Information, Strategic Focus and Clarity of Roles.** Several Board members noted that information overload can undermine effective oversight and called for more concise, targeted reporting focused on risks, performance, trade-offs, and areas requiring Board decisions. Members supported streamlining reporting, reducing duplication between Board and committees, improving agenda prioritization, increasing virtual engagement, and making Board discussions more strategic and decision-focused, while maintaining transparency, trust, and clear accountability. There was support for applying proportionality and differentiation, focusing Board attention on areas of highest risk, greatest impact and most significant strategic value, and for leveraging intersessional activities, with some requests to reflect on access thereto.
- e. **Transparency and trust.** Transparency emerged as a key theme, linked to trust and supported by effective communication. Some observations noted that transparency should not be equated with information volume and that effective governance requires effective prioritization of information rather than more reporting. One constituency noted that discussions should avoid framing issues and trade-offs as binary mutually exclusive choices, as further exploration may identify alternative approaches or relevant considerations.
- f. **Process to consider change.** There were queries about the governance reform process itself, including the role of the EGC, consultation pathways, and how decisions will be informed and communicated across governance bodies. Members requested clearer evidence of the governance problems that proposed reforms aim to address, impact assessments for changes, measurable success indicators, and safeguards to ensure that efficiency gains do not come at the expense of equity, transparency, meaningful participation, or stakeholder trust.

Secretariat Response

48. The Secretariat welcomed the constructive discussion and acknowledged broad alignment on the need to strengthen governance effectiveness to meet an evolving context. Governance effectiveness lies in striking the right balance between efficiency and inclusiveness, strong oversight and agility, transparency and level of information, core governance needs, and mission delivery. Such balance looks different from the perspective of different constituencies and stakeholders, hence the challenge to identify a single perfect solution, as governance will continue evolving through ongoing discussion, experimentation, and adjustment.

49. Trust was underscored as a critical enabler of effective governance. Governance is a means to support mission delivery, not an end in itself. The Secretariat remains committed to continuing engagement with Board members and refining proposals based on the feedback received.

08. The 2025 OIG Annual Report

Presentation

50. The Inspector General presented the OIG's 2025 Annual Report and Annual Opinion on

Governance, Risk Management and Controls against a backdrop of growing uncertainty and change. Overall, no significant issues were identified in governance, risk management, or internal controls that would significantly affect the achievement of Global Fund objectives. However, the report emphasized that the most significant threats remain external, particularly funding constraints, geopolitical pressures, and challenges related to domestic financing.

51. The Inspector General cautioned that the cumulative burden of simultaneous demands—including GC8 implementation, Secretariat reorganization, foreign exchange pressures, and engagement in broader health ecosystem initiatives—risks stretching organizational capacity at a time when disciplined execution is most critical. In this context, inadequate prioritization was identified as one of the most significant risk facing the organization, as well as funding constraints and geopolitical disruption.
52. The OIG presented its recent reorganization, introducing a new Strategic Advice, Insights and Prevention (SAIP) team focused on forward-looking strategic reviews, advisories, insight notes and fraud prevention; and an evolved assurance function placing greater emphasis on integrated assurance, validation of existing mechanisms, and embedding rapid reviews into core delivery. The Inspector General reaffirmed the OIG's independence, noting no interference in its work during 2025 and confirmed it had sufficient resources and capacity to fulfill its mandate, with all activities conducted in accordance with its Charter and applicable international professional standards.

Board discussion

53. The AFC Vice-Chair confirmed the AFC welcomed the OIG's Report overall opinion and conclusions. Themes highlighted for continued attention included: clearer prioritization and trade-offs, differentiated assurance, the evolving risk environment under GC8, and vigilance on transition, vulnerable populations, RSSH performance, and fraud and integrity risks. The AFC emphasized the importance of strong country-level assurance through in-country audits and direct engagement with communities and implementers.
54. Board members welcomed the OIG's report and raised the following points:
 - a. **Prioritization and risk-informed decision-making:** Several Board members endorsed the Inspector General's assessment that ambition, resources and implementation realities must be more closely aligned. The Board must take responsibility for prioritization, including being prepared to accept that some risks will materialize when risk appetite is genuinely operationalized. Several members noted that the Board is often more inclined to add priorities than remove them and called for a candid discussion about what could be stopped to maintain strategic focus. One member asked what indicators the Board should monitor to determine whether (i) the risk appetite framework is being effectively operationalized and (ii) the organization is genuinely moving from monitoring to steering risk. Members also welcomed the focus on execution capacity as a critical enabler of GC8 delivery and recognized the need to reallocate staff time accordingly.
 - b. **Transition, sustainability and vulnerable populations:** Transition and sustainability were major themes raised in the discussion, and several constituencies welcomed the OIG's planned review of transition under GC8 and GC9. Members emphasized that transition timelines must be calibrated to country preparedness, service continuity capacity and domestic financing realities, rather than to grant cycle schedules alone. Some members stressed that communities and civil society play a critical role in implementation and should be recognized as partners – rather than consultation stakeholders – and their participation and roles must be explicitly protected. Several members raised concern for fragile and COEs, key and vulnerable populations, and the risk of service disruption where external financing and humanitarian delivery platforms remain critical.

Concerns about RSSH absorption was also raised, noting weak mid-cycle performance in this area.

- c. **OIG structure, capacity and assurance model evolution:** The Board was broadly supportive of the OIG's reorganization, and the evolution of the assurance model. Many members welcomed the new strategic review, advisory and insight products, while seeking greater clarity on how these would inform Board decision-making, support implementation of the Risk Appetite Framework, contribute to evidence and learning processes, and strengthen governance effectiveness. Several constituencies also welcomed the increased use of rapid assurance reviews as a timely and appropriate oversight tool in the current operating environment. Two constituencies raised capacity-related considerations for the OIG and cautioned against overburdening the function given growing expectations. One member suggested that the new SAIP team could consider a review of Governance Effectiveness.
- d. **Agreed Management Actions (AMA):** Some members raised concern about the low AMA completion rate, requesting greater clarity beyond headline completion figures and insights into the progress made on AMAs that remain open, including work already undertaken and cases where no AMA was issued. Members welcomed the planned review of the AMA process expected to be presented to the AFC in October 2026.
- e. **Fraud, integrity and country-level controls:** Some members encouraged continued strengthening of integrity measures, procurement oversight and country-level controls, and welcomed the proactive integrity review model as a timely and practical tool. There were questions on how recurring systemic findings would be more systematically integrated into the Risk Appetite Framework and incorporated into strategic decision-making.

OIG response

55. The OIG provided the following responses and clarifications:

- a. **Prioritization and risk-informed decision-making:** The OIG welcomed a candid Board discussion on prioritization: effective implementation of the Risk Appetite Framework will require a willingness to make deliberate trade-offs, accept that some risks will occur, and support management and country teams when those risks materialize. On resources and efficiency, the OIG has increasingly leveraged AI and reduced support costs to maximize delivery, while seeking to model the fiscal discipline being requested across the organization.
- b. **Transition, sustainability and vulnerable populations:** The strategic review of the Global Fund's approach to supporting transition under GC8 and GC9 is underway and will consider transition readiness in fragile and COE settings as part of this work. Communities are critical stakeholders in assurance work, including planning, fieldwork and, where appropriate, use of community-generated data.
- c. **OIG structure, capacity and assurance model evolution:** The OIG has the necessary staff and resources to fulfil its mandate under its new structure. The IG acknowledged the members' request for a review of Governance Effectiveness and committed to following up with them offline.
- d. **AMAs, fraud, integrity and country-level controls:** An independent review of the AMA framework is underway. Future reporting will provide greater clarity on progress made against open AMAs and on cases where no AMA was developed. On proactive integrity reviews, the model is designed to identify programs at the highest risk of fraud and corruption, support the prioritization of reviews in collaboration with the Secretariat, and ensure that findings inform both current grant implementation and the design of future grant cycles. The 2025 Proactive Integrity review pilot had already led to proactive investigations and generated practical insights to support Country Teams in strengthening program delivery and risk management.

Secretariat response

56. The Secretariat provided the following clarifications:

- a. **RSSH:** On RSSH absorption, it was noted that investments typically have slower initial absorption and, based on trends from previous grant cycles, spending accelerates over time, with final absorption rates reaching 84–85%; a similar pattern is expected in the third year of GC7.
- b. **AMAs:** The 20% AMA completion rate reflects a rolling three-year average incorporating disruption in 2025. It was emphasized that an AMA remaining formally open does not indicate a lack of progress, as substantial work has been completed on most outstanding AMAs.

Conclusions and next steps

57. The Board Vice-Chair closed the session by affirming the Board's strong appreciation of the OIG's independent assurance and the shared commitment to oversight, accountability, and continuous improvement across the partnership. The OIG will proceed with planned work on transition under GC8 and GC9, proactive integrity reviews, integrated assurance, rapid reviews and strategic advice products, and will bring a revised AMA approach to the AFC in October 2026.

09. Approach to Evidence and Learning

Presentation

58. The Board Chair opened the session by noting the importance of addressing the future of the evaluation function in a timely manner, and considering the findings of the OIG audit on the Independent Evaluation Function¹, the implications for staff affected by the current uncertainty, and the heavy 2026 governance agenda. Building on the findings of the OIG Audit, the Secretariat presented a proposed shift from a standalone, independent evaluation function with a dedicated, structurally independent oversight body, toward an integrated evidence and learning model, leveraging existing and new evidence - including the commissioning of external evaluations - more effectively to support timely decision-oriented learning.

59. The proposed approach would (i) be led by the Secretariat through its Strategy and Policy Hub (SPH), with cross-functional Secretariat engagement and a complementary OIG role, and (ii) first make use of existing internal and external evidence and retain the possibility of targeted external evaluations where independence, specialized expertise, or evidence gaps require them. The Secretariat noted risks associated with this approach related to independence, potential evidence gaps, uneven quality, and resourcing. Proposed mitigations included clearer definition of roles and responsibilities, common analytical frameworks, regular governance engagement, and a review of the model after 18-24 months. The Secretariat's assessment is that the benefits of this integrated model, given the current environment and availability of objective evidence through multiple sources outweigh these risks.

60. The Inspector General confirmed the OIG had been consulted and that its independence, mandate, and discretion over its work would be preserved in the proposed approach. The Inspector General highlighted that (i) the proposal makes good use of scarce resources by drawing on existing evidence; (ii) emphasizes agility by recognizing that traditional evaluations are not always the best response for today's needs, where decisions often need to be made quickly and therefore require

¹ GF-OIG-26-003 https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/5c1n5ypo/oig_gf-oig-26-003_report_en.pdf

timely, practical and decision-relevant insight; and (iii) preserves the SC's ability to commission external evaluations where these add value. The proposed approach is not a direct substitute for the current evaluation function. Instead, it would reflect a shift from the current model, placing greater emphasis on leveraging existing evidence, assurance work, performance data, external assessments, and other learning mechanisms to support organizational accountability and continuous improvement. In that context, the role of the OIG was delineated – it would neither assume responsibility for evaluations nor undertake evaluation activities as such work falls outside the OIG's mandate, resource base, and technical expertise, particularly where it involves large-scale evaluative studies or highly specialized research questions. The OIG Charter explicitly limits the OIG's remit to assurance and advisory functions, namely audits, investigations, consulting engagements, and counter-fraud activities, and does not provide for the conduct of evaluations.

Board discussion

61. The SC Chair reported that the Committee had several substantive engagements on this topic, with broad convergence that evaluation should be used strategically and selectively, focused on high-priority questions where it clearly adds value and can inform decision-making in a timely way. The SC also noted remaining questions around operationalization, capacity, budget, independence, and the ability of the Board and Committees to request external evaluation work.
62. During the discussion that followed, the Board raised the following points:
- a. **Proposed approach:** Board members generally recognized the need to respond to the OIG Audit findings and to make evidence and learning more timely, useful, and cost-effective. Several Constituencies supported the direction of travel toward a more integrated, agile, and decision-oriented model that better leverages existing internal and external evidence, Secretariat analytical capacity, and OIG outputs, while some other Board members expressed significant reservations about the proposed model, particularly where it would represent a substantial departure from established independent evaluation global practice and/or potentially affect the Global Fund's credibility, quality assurance, and governance oversight.
 - b. **Independence:** Several Board members expressed discomfort with the proposed shift away from a structurally independent oversight body, and lack of clarity on related mitigation controls. Members stressed that the proposed model must include robust safeguards to protect objectivity, impartiality, and institutional credibility, particularly where evidence synthesis or evaluative work would be undertaken within the Secretariat. Some Board members expressed concern that placing the function within SPH could create actual or perceived conflicts of interest given that evaluation questions may relate to Secretariat strategies or programs. Some members emphasized that independence should be calibrated to the nature of the evaluative question, while others held that an independent evaluation remains fundamental given the scale, strategic role, and accountability needs of the Global Fund to demonstrate that investments are achieving programmatic outcomes.
 - c. **Role of the OIG:** The Board welcomed the continued role of the OIG as an independent source of assurance, advisory review, and strategic insight, while seeking clarity on the limits of that role under the OIG Charter. Some members noted that the OIG cannot conduct program impact evaluations under its current Charter and others cautioned against placing an inappropriate burden on the OIG or blurring its independence and assurance role with managerial or operational decision-making, or evaluative responsibilities. One member noted that the OIG Charter's exclusion may need to be revisited given the context and division of labor behind it is now significantly different.
 - d. **Governance role and oversight:** Several members requested greater clarity on the governance bodies' role in identifying evidence priorities, shaping workplans, and determining when external or independent work should be commissioned. Members emphasized the need for regular and

structured engagement with the SC, including a clear mechanism through which governance bodies can shape priorities, challenge the evidence base, and request additional analysis, particularly since the approach would move away from the current Multi-Year Evaluation Calendar and annual evaluation workplans which are currently approved by the SC and Board.

- e. **Learning and use of evidence:** Several members emphasized the importance of organizational learning and accountability and the need to ensure that findings are translated into action, course correction, and support to countries, communities, and implementers. Some members highlighted the importance of country-led learning, community and implementer input in identifying questions, and partner engagement, including the use of evidence from technical partners, in-country partners, and the broader evidence ecosystem. Some members highlighted the unique role of the Technical Review Panel and encouraged greater use of the evidence it generates.
- f. **Operationalization:** Several members requested further information on Secretariat and OIG capacity, analytical capabilities, resource implications, and expected savings. Members noted that the proposed model would require the right skills and systems within the Secretariat, clear differentiation of responsibilities between the Secretariat and OIG, and sufficient resources to commission external work where needed. There were several requests for clearer criteria for (i) deciding whether a question should be addressed through internal analysis, external expert analysis, an independent evaluation, or OIG work, and (ii) how quality and consistency would be assured across these approaches. Some members requested protected funding with Board or SC authority to request independent evaluation work.
- g. **Proposal governance pathway:** While many members expressed support for the overall direction of travel, several emphasized that further work and SC discussion was required before the Board could be asked to approve a final proposal. Related requests included clearer articulation of governance implications, consideration of alternative options or transitional arrangements, and clarity on how the proposed 18–24 month review would be conducted, including whether it should be external to the OIG given that the OIG is a central pillar of the proposed new model.

Secretariat Response

63. The Secretariat provided the following commentary and clarifications:

- a. **Independence:** The Secretariat acknowledged Board feedback and committed to return with greater clarity on how to protect independence and balance agility with independent challenge, and how governance will shape evidence priorities.
- b. **Governance role and oversight:** The clear Board steer was noted that further work and SC discussion is needed on input, decision-making, and safeguards to preserve credibility in an agile model. It also noted that a fixed multi-year calendar should not be replaced by an overly rigid workplan, but that regular engagement with SC Leadership or the Committee could support prioritization and course correction.
- c. **Learning and use of evidence:** Board commentary on learning, GC8 shifts, the need to translate findings into changes in practice and support to countries, and the importance of making better use of the TRP evidence were also acknowledged.
- d. **Operationalization:** Further work will be undertaken to assess resource needs, including potential costs for external evaluations or other evaluative work. While the required analytical capabilities are not currently fully in place within SPH the ongoing transformation within the Secretariat could help build or better use capacity over time. Board questions around staffing, organizational design, and transformation have implications for staff and roles, and therefore require careful handling as the proposal is refined.
- e. **Governance pathway:** The Secretariat acknowledged the differing comfort levels among the Board with the proposal put forward and committed to return to the relevant Committees with greater clarity for further discussion.

Inspector General response

64. The Inspector General reiterated that the OIG's role would need to remain clearly defined. The OIG cannot be positioned as part of Secretariat decision-making processes, given it must retain the ability to audit those processes and associated systems. The IG (i) cautioned that a similar structural replacement of the current evaluation function would not address the root causes identified through the audit, and (ii) emphasized the importance of identifying where independent evaluation can add value, and which types of work would most usefully inform governance and management decisions.

Conclusions and next steps

65. The Secretariat will present an update to the SC, as well as the EGC and the AFC on assurance and governance dimensions, as relevant, before returning to the Board for a decision on a refined approach.

10. Global Health Ecosystem including Global Fund-Gavi Collaboration Update

Presentation

66. The Secretariat presented an update on partnership developments in the global health ecosystem, including implications for how the Global Fund positions itself within a changing external environment. The Board provided steer on the three pathways serving as a framework for engagements and the appropriate balance across each: (i) evolving to better deliver on the Global Fund mission; (ii) delivering synergies with other partners; and (ii) contributing to the system-wide transformation.

67. A progress update was provided on work with a few partners, including the World Bank, Africa CDC, and Gavi. The discussion on Gavi followed a joint Technical Briefing with Gavi's Board on 30 June 2026, and further details were shared on the collaboration roadmap on TB that includes a focus on four key areas: (i) joint evidence gathering for decision-making and implementation; (ii) country planning; (iii) funding for procurement and delivery; and (iv) institutional costing and governance.

Board discussion

68. The SC Chair summarized the Committee's discussion at its 30th meeting in May 2026, noting broad support for the three pathways and their framing, while emphasizing the need for flexibility as the ecosystem evolves. The SC Chair further noted strong support for collaboration with Gavi on TB, anchoring the work in the Global Fund's core mandate and comparative advantage, and ensuring that collaboration delivers tangible country-level outcomes without adding burden.

69. During the discussion that followed the Board raised and provided steer on the following points:

- a. **Three-pathway framework:** The Board broadly supported the proposed three-pathway approach, with broad support for pathways 1 and 2, but with differing views on how much emphasis to place on pathway 3. Pathway 1 was noted as an area where the Global Fund is

already doing a lot (e.g., NGFP, integration shifts) that could benefit from enhanced communication or amplification for external audiences. The Board emphasized that further work should remain practical, focused and anchored in the Global Fund's core mandate and comparative advantages. Several members considered the approach pragmatic and appropriate in the current environment, particularly given resource constraints. Several members supported using the three pathways to focus efforts, while recognizing that the relative weighting of the pathways requires continued consideration as the ecosystem evolves. Some Constituencies emphasized the Global Fund must identify both what it should take forward and deprioritize.

- b. **Collaboration with partners:** Some Constituencies urged the Secretariat to be pragmatic and to prioritize areas where collaboration can deliver concrete outcomes and to avoid prolonged discussions that do not translate into action. Several members encouraged strengthened collaboration with partners, including Gavi, the World Bank, the Global Financing Facility and WHO, and commended the continued work with the World Bank to allow use of IDA money for PPM/Wambo. It was noted that collaboration should include clear accountability, measurable indicators of success, and greater clarity on governance pathways and expected outputs.
- c. **Structural reform and system-wide transformation:** Members expressed differing views on the extent to which the Global Fund should engage in broader system-wide transformation or structural reform discussions. Some members also cited resource constraints, governance complexity, cost and uncertainty regarding value added. Others considered that the Global Fund should remain actively engaged in wider global health architecture discussions, including through the WHO process, and share its governance model and technical expertise where relevant. Several members supported pausing further internal analysis of institutional or structural changes until the Accra Reset and WHO processes conclude.
- d. **Country impact:** Board members emphasized that collaboration should be assessed by whether it delivers measurable impact at country level. Several members stressed the importance of listening to implementers and countries, focusing on country-level activities, and ensuring that collaboration lowers complexity. Members emphasized the importance of country ownership, country dialogue, and leveraging existing country mechanisms including CCMs.
- e. **Communities at the center:** Several members emphasized that communities must remain central to global health ecosystem collaboration. Some members stressed the need to preserve the value of community engagement, inclusive governance, CCM processes, and country dialogue in partnership discussions. Some constituencies encouraged the Global Fund to engage in broader ecosystem discussions in ways that support community and civil society participation.
- f. **Engagement with Gavi:** There were mixed views on continuing the intense phase of work with Gavi with some members questioning the level of effort relative to impact and others wanting to see the work progress at greater scale and pace. There was, however, broad support for prioritizing collaboration with Gavi on TB. Several members called for a clearer roadmap, milestones, financing arrangements, and measurable outcomes for TB collaboration, including joint planning, implementation, and monitoring. Some members noted the need to draw lessons from collaboration on malaria, where there can still be some focused and concrete opportunities for programmatic impact and identify ways to surface and resolve bottlenecks at the governance level, and for joint learning work for both organizations. It was underlined that vaccines complement rather than displace broader prevention measures. Some constituencies supported further exploring grant-cycle alignment as a practical means of strengthening collaboration and simplifying country processes, particularly for TB and malaria, provided it reduces rather than adds to country-level burden.

Secretariat response

70. The Secretariat provided the following commentary:

- a. **Three-pathway framework:** The general Board support for the three-pathway framework was

noted, while recognizing the need to consider how institutional focus and effort should be weighted across the three pathways.

- b. **Collaboration with Gavi:** Acknowledging mixed views on continued intense collaboration with Gavi, the Secretariat noted that they would continue work based on the Roadmaps, while focusing most heavily on TB.

Conclusions and next steps

71. The Secretariat proposed to bring a decision point at the next Board Meeting in October 2026 to further enable and provide clear guidance on the ongoing and future collaboration between Gavi and the Global Fund.

11.Executive sessions

72. The Board held two executive sessions on Day 1 and 2 of the meeting respectively. Records of the scheduled sessions are deposited with the General Counsel in line with provisions of the Board and Committee Operating Procedures.

12. Closing session

73. In her closing remarks, the Board Vice Chair thanked Board Members for their active engagement, thoughtful contributions, and unwavering commitment to the Global Fund's mission throughout the meeting. The Vice Chair underscored that discussions over the two days demonstrated the Board's strength and collective commitment to disciplined governance, strategic focus, and partnership, while providing the Secretariat with valuable guidance on key issues and future pathways. The quality of the Board's deliberations reflected its dedication to responsible stewardship and to delivering greater impact for countries and communities the Global Fund serves. Looking ahead, the Board Vice Chair outlined key milestones in the Board's governance calendar, highlighting the intensive period leading up to the October 2026 Board meeting. Recognizing the timelines and significant decisions ahead, the Vice Chair encouraged Board Members to remain engaged, agile, and prepared for close collaboration across committees and the Board.
74. The Vice Chair concluded by expressing appreciation to outgoing Board and Committee Members for their leadership, service, and contributions to strengthening the Global Fund and advancing its mission. She also thanked the Board Leadership Nomination Committee for their work on the successful process to appoint the incoming Board Leadership, Committee Leadership, the Governance Team, the Secretariat, interpreters, and all those who contributed to the successful delivery of the 55th Board Meeting.
75. Welcoming the incoming Board Leadership whose term will commence following the 56th Board Meeting, and reaffirming confidence in the partnership's collective work, the Vice Chair closed by recognizing the dedication of all participants and formally declared the Board Meeting adjourned.

Annex 1 – Decisions Taken at the 55th Board Meeting

Decision Point	Decision Point Text	Voting Summary		
		For	Against	Abstain
GF/B55DP01	Approval of the Agenda The Agenda for the 55th Board Meeting (GF/B55/01) is approved.	Unanimous		
GF/B55/DP02	Approval of the Rapporteur Aishath Samiya from the South East Asia constituency is designated as Rapporteur for the 55th Board Meeting.	Unanimous		
GF/B55/DP03	Evolution of Risk Appetite Framework 1. The Board recalls its ultimate responsibility to the Global Fund's stakeholders for overseeing the implementation of effective risk management. 2. Based upon the recommendation of the Audit and Finance Committee, the Board approves the Risk Appetite Framework, as set forth in Annex 1 to GF/B55/02, and the Risk Appetite Statements, as set forth in Annexes 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 to GF/B55/02. 3. This decision point and the amended Risk Appetite Framework and Risk Appetite Statements approved by it shall supersede all prior Board decisions on the Risk Appetite Framework and Risk Appetite Statements. <u>Budgetary Implications: (included in the OPEX budget)</u>	Unanimous		

GF/B55/DP04	Non-Global Fund-Financed Procurement Policy and Financial Mechanism 1. The Board: i. recalls its approval through GF/B48/DP07 for the Secretariat's continued operationalization of non-Global Fund-financed procurement orders for products and services as they become available on wambo.org; ii. recognizes the evolving context, including the rapid emergence of regional and national pooled procurement mechanisms, and the overall need to support continued access to affordable, quality assured health products for HIV, tuberculosis and malaria programs; iii. recognizes the need for a separate non-Global Fund-financed procurement mechanism to support future transactions, while safeguarding the Global Fund's core resources for allocation and use in line with the recipient-driven, Board-determined priorities of the Global Fund; and iv. notes that the Secretariat will ensure there is a dedicated 24-month review of the implementation of (i) the Policy on Non-Global Fund-Financed Procurement through the Pooled Procurement Mechanism (PPM)/wambo.org and (ii) the non-Global Fund financed procurement mechanism established below, to be presented to the Board through the relevant committees.	Unanimous		
-------------	--	-----------	--	--

	<u>PART A: Policy on Non-Global Fund-Financed Procurement through the Pooled Procurement Mechanism (PPM)/wambo.org (the “Policy”)</u> 2. Based on the recommendation of the Strategy Committee (“SC”), the Board approves: i. The Policy on Non-Global Fund-Financed Procurement through the Pooled Procurement Mechanism (PPM)/wambo.org which sets out the principles that govern the procurement of goods and services offered through PPM/wambo.org for non-Global Fund-financed transactions, as set forth in Annex 1 to GF/B55/05 Rev 1; ii. Delegation of authority to the Executive Director for operationalization of the Policy and directs the Secretariat to return to the SC at its October 2026 meeting with a further articulation of the safeguards to be established within the operational framework to achieve value for money, protect against market distortion and supplier concentration, and support effective oversight and reporting on implementation and associated risks for SC input; and iii. Delegation to the SC of authority for governance oversight of the Policy, ensuring alignment with the Global Fund’s broader market shaping objectives and strategic priorities. Additionally, the Board understands that for implementation of certain aspects of the Policy a reasonable transition period may be needed. The Board authorizes the Secretariat to allow for such a transition period when needed. <u>PART B: Non-Global Fund-Financed Procurement Mechanism</u>			
--	---	--	--	--

	3. Based on the recommendation of the Audit and Finance Committee (“AFC”), the Board: i. approves the establishment of the non-Global Fund financed procurement mechanism (“NGFPM”), as a segregated pool of restricted assets and liabilities decoupled from replenishment and allocation periods; ii. agrees that the NGFPM is a Board-approved initiative for which the Global Fund may mobilize, in accordance with applicable policies, additional resources, which may be supported by credit enhancement and risk mitigation instruments; iii. decides that NGFPM resources shall be available for the objectives of the Policy on Non-Global Fund-Financed Procurement through the Pooled Procurement Mechanism (PPM)/wambo.org, as set forth in Annex 1 to GF/B55/05 Rev 1, including for the offer and provision of funds through a pre-financing facility within the NGFPM, on such terms and conditions as the Secretariat may deem appropriate; iv. delegates to the AFC the authority for the governance oversight of the NGFPM and the approval of the annual audited financial statements of the NGFPM; v. acknowledges that the financial framework developed by the Secretariat, leveraging existing Global Fund policies, principles and controls, shall guide the financial management of the NGFPM; vi. affirms that the costs incurred in the establishment, initial operationalization and scale-up of the NGFPM will be funded			
--	--	--	--	--

	through existing Secretariat resources and restricted financial contributions, with the aim that the NGFPM will become self-sustaining through a cost-recovery model to cover associated management and operating costs, and such costs shall not form part of the Global Fund's annual budget for operating expenditures; and vii. directs the Secretariat to include the NGFPM in regular reporting on financial performance. Additionally, while the Board expects efforts will be made to fully implement NGFPM upon its approval, the Board understands that for implementation of certain aspects of the mechanism a reasonable transition period may be needed. The Board authorizes the Secretariat to allow for such a transition period when needed. <u>Budgetary implications (included in, or additional to, OPEX budget)</u> Within the scope of the Board-approved GC8 NextGen Catalytic Investment (CI) priority, the Secretariat is exploring use of the CI to support selected initial scale-up costs. Additional costs directly attributable to implementation of the NGFP and management of the NGFPM will be covered through existing Secretariat resources and earmarked external private sector funds, and subsequently through cost-recovery fees generated by the mechanism. The anticipated resourcing costs, as well as the additional earmarked private sector funds mobilized for NGFPM initial scale-up, will be further clarified in the coming months. This costing will be presented to the AFC in October 2026 as part of the approval of the 2027 OPEX Budget.			
--	--	--	--	--

Annex 2 – Documents List

Reference	Document title	Purpose
GF/B55/01	The 55 th Board Meeting Agenda	For Decision
GF/B55/02	Risk Appetite Framework and Statements	For Decision
GF/B55/03A	2025 Annual Risk Management Report	For Information
GF/B55/03B	2026 ORR Update	For Information
GF/B55/04A	GC8 (2027-2029) Strategy Costing	For Input
GF/B55/04B	GC8 Strategy Costing and OPEX Pathway (2027-2029)	For Input
GF/B55/05_Rev 1	Policy on Non-Global Fund-Financed Procurement	For Decision
GF/B55/06	Annual Procurement & Market Shaping Report	For Information
GF/B55/07A	Ethics Office 2025 Annual Report and Opinion	For Information
GF/B55/07B	Ethics Office 2025 Annual Report and Opinion	For Information
GF/B55/08	Executive Director Selection Process Update	For Information
GF/B55/09	Governance Effectiveness	For Input
GF/B55/10	OIG Annual Report	For Information
GF/B55/11	Approach to Evidence and Learning	For Input
GF/B55/12	The Global Fund in the Health Ecosystem	For Input
GF/B55/13	Update on Resource Mobilization and 8th Replenishment	For Information
GF/B55/14	Strategic Performance Report - Executive Summary	For Information
GF/B55/15	Report of the Coordinating Group and Board Leadership	For Information
GF/B55/15 Annex 1	Annex 1 - Governance work plans	For Information
GF/B55/16	GC7 Country Funding Update	For Information
GF/B55/17	Financial Performance as at 31 March 2026	For Information
GF/B55/18	2025 Report of the Independent Evaluation Panel	For Information
GF/B55/19	Report of the Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer Synthesis & Learning	For Information
GF/B55/20	Recoveries Report - Period Ended 31 March	For Information
GF/B55/21	2025 TRP Performance Assessment	For Information

Annex 3 – Glossary of Acronyms

AFC = Audit and Finance Committee
AI = Artificial intelligence
AMA = Agreed management action
CCM = Country Coordinating Mechanism
C19RM = COVID-19 Response Mechanism
CRO = Chief Risk Officer
ED = Executive Director
EGC = Ethics and Governance Committee
GC = Grant cycle (e.g. GC8, GC7)
GHA = Global Health Architecture
IG = Inspector General
LFA = Local Fund Agent
NGFP = Non-Global Fund Finance Procurement Policy
NPOC = near-patient molecular diagnostics
OIG = Office of the Inspector General
OPEX = operating expenses
PHC = Primary Health Care
PFM = Public Financial Management
PPM = Pooled procurement mechanism
RSSH = Resilient and sustainable systems for health
SAIP = Strategic Advice, Insights and Prevention
SC = Strategy Committee
SPH = Strategy and Policy Hub
TB = Tuberculosis
TRP = Technical Review Panel
WHO = World Health Organization

Constituency Statements

55th Board Meeting

55th Board Meeting
8 July 2026

Constituency statements

1. Pre-Day Session: The Evolving Global Health Ecosystem: Perspectives on Partnership, Country Leadership and Impact

West and Central Africa

Primary focus should be on regional capacity strengthening towards cementing the over 2 decades gains we have collectively recorded.

Western Pacific Region

The Western Pacific Region constituency supports the proposed three-pathway framework as a useful way to organize the Global Fund's response to an evolving global health ecosystem. The framework appropriately recognizes the need to simultaneously strengthen the Global Fund's own effectiveness, deepen partnerships, and engage in broader health architecture reform discussions. We further propose five recommendations:

1. Assess the pathways through a country lens, focusing on whether they reduce fragmentation, parallel processes, and transaction costs for countries.
2. Prioritize the intersection of Pathways 1 and 2, where the Global Fund's strengths in country ownership, community engagement, implementation, market shaping, and partnership can deliver the clearest country-level benefits.
3. Engage in global reform discussions with a clear message: future health architecture should strengthen country ownership, elevate community leadership, reduce duplication, and align support behind national plans.
4. Develop a small set of country-level indicators to track whether the pathways are reducing parallel requirements, strengthening community participation, and improving partner alignment.
5. Ensure Pacific Island countries and other small islands and climate-vulnerable states are explicitly considered in reforms, particularly on procurement, financing, transition, health systems, and regional approaches.

In summary, we support the three-pathway approach, with priority attention on reforms and partnerships that produce measurable benefits for countries, communities, and the sustainability of national health responses. The Global Fund should continue to be a strong voice for country ownership, community leadership, and greater coherence across the global health ecosystem.

South East Asia

TBA

UNAIDS

NA

2. Welcome Reception

South East Asia

N/A

UNAIDS

NA

3. Opening of the Board Meeting

Eastern Mediterranean Region

The EMRC arrives at the 55th Board Meeting at a moment of compounding institutional stress. The Global Fund enters Grant Cycle 8 carrying a replenishment outcome of US\$12.65 billion against an investment case of US\$18 billion — a 30% structural shortfall before conversion risk is applied. Almost every country will receive a reduced allocation that may affect essential investments in HIV, tuberculosis and malaria and reverse hard-won achievements, particularly in the Eastern Mediterranean Region (EMR), which is grappling with conflict, displacement, fiscal distress, sanctions-related constraints and other complex challenges. The approved OPEX envelope of US\$930 million for 2027–2029 carries a structural gap of approximately US\$130 million against GC7 and is being implemented through a two-track pathway that will reshape the Secretariat precisely when GC8 demands peak execution capacity. The four strategic preconditions for credible GC8 sustainability and transition agenda — co-financing performance, community systems strength, integrated and continuous service delivery, and reliable independent evaluation — are all under simultaneous pressure. The institution is also navigating a leadership transition, with an Executive Director selection pending until BM56, concurrent with the early implementation phase of GC8.

The EMRC's diagnostic is consistent: the organization is being asked to make its most consequential programmatic commitments at a moment its monitoring, funding and sustainable financing, responsible and country-tailored transition planning, governance, and operational foundations are most strained. We engage constructively, with specific and grounded asks. Our positions are anchored in the documents before this Board and in the evidence produced by the Board's independent functions.

Developing Country NGO

This is a defining moment for the Global Fund Partnership.

The decisions and discussions before this Board are not simply operational, they will shape the future direction, credibility and effectiveness of the Global Fund; and affect the people and communities the Global Fund was designed to serve.

We recognise the unprecedented financial pressures facing the Partnership and we support the need to adapt; but not at the cost of leaving CSOs and communities behind. Our concern is not whether the Global Fund changes. Our concern is **how** those changes are made, whether they remain faithful to the Strategy this Board approved, and whether operational reforms are beginning to redefine strategic commitments without explicit Board direction.

Across the papers before us, we see four interconnected shifts: how we manage risk, allocate increasingly constrained resources, engage partners within a changing global health architecture, and govern the partnership itself. Collectively, these represent a significant evolution of the Global Fund model. They require **active** Board stewardship, not simply operational implementation.

Financial efficiency, sustainability and risk management are essential. But they are not the Strategy. They are tools to deliver it. The Strategy must remain grounded in equity, human rights, gender equality, meaningful community and civil society leadership and country ownership. These are not discretionary principles that can be recalibrated to fit fiscal realities, they are the foundation of the Global Fund's success.

This is why we are concerned by the limited visibility of community, rights and gender (CRG) across the work of the Management Executive Committee. CRG cannot remain the responsibility of one department or appear only in papers explicitly labelled as CRG. It must be systematically embedded across grant design, portfolio optimisation, sustainability

planning, Next Gen market shaping, risk management and performance oversight; CRG approaches must be financially sustained. When CRG is absent from these discussions, it inevitably becomes absent from the decisions that shape implementation.

Across our delegation, these concerns are no longer theoretical. Countries are reporting increasing pressure to end civil society implementers despite our dual-track financing principle and proven track record in delivering results and effective management. It is an illusion that by barring civil society meaningful involvement in GC8 implementation we will achieve efficiency and greater standardisation. The Global Fund Secretariat must uphold the Board's commitments to country ownership by respecting country-led decision-making, sustaining investments in community systems and community-led responses, and avoiding giving directives in areas that this Board has explicitly recognised as country-led.

Taken together, these are not isolated implementation decisions. They suggest a broader shift in which operational efficiency takes precedence over the Global Fund Partnership principles this Board has repeatedly reaffirmed. This leaves us with a fundamental governance question: Are we implementing the Strategy this Board approved, or are we gradually redefining it through operational practice? If the answer is unclear, then we have a governance responsibility to pause, course-correct, and ensure that implementation reflects the Strategy this Board approved, not operational convenience or fiscal pressure.

We must ensure that sustainability does not become a rationale to shift risk to countries and civil society; that transition does not justify reduced investment in community systems; and that coordination does not become centralisation at the expense of meaningful participation and country ownership.

The decisions we take this week will shape the future beyond Grant Cycle 8. They will define what kind of Global Fund emerges from this period of uncertainty.

We therefore urge the Board to reaffirm, through its decisions, not only its words, that community, rights and gender are not peripheral considerations. They are strategic imperatives that must be embedded across every committee, workstream, reform process and decision this Board takes.

In a world where solidarity is increasingly under pressure, the Global Fund must remain a partnership that stands with communities, not one that asks them to carry an even greater burden. We don't need reminding that the envelope has shrunk but we do need to be reminded of our commitment to the people we serve.

As we make these decisions, we should ask ourselves one simple question:

Will these decisions strengthen or weaken the Global Fund's commitment to equity, human rights, gender equality, meaningful community and civil society leadership, country ownership, and ultimately, the people we exist to serve?

Communities

The Communities Delegation represents people living with HIV, affected by TB and malaria, and reached by community-led responses across every region represented at this table. Behind every agenda item in this statement sits the same reality: the HIV, TB and malaria responses are already off track against our 2030 commitments, and the people furthest from power, key and vulnerable populations, women and girls, criminalized communities, are the first to lose ground when funding tightens, and governance gets leaner. We accept the hard trade-offs this moment demands, leaner delegations, tighter reporting, a smaller OPEX envelope, but only where they come with real transparency, explicitly named trade-offs, and funding pathways that put communities in the driver's seat rather than at the back of the queue. Risk to human rights, gender equality, and access must be measured and reported with the same discipline as financial risk, not quietly assumed away as the cost of "complex environments." Whatever else changes in how this Board and this Fund do their work, the

depth of community voice that keeps this partnership accountable to the people it serves must be the last thing to give, not the first. The success of the Global Fund over the last 20 years has been built on a multistakeholder inclusive, participatory process both at the Board level and in each country where the Global Fund operates. These principles are worth fighting for if we remain committed to our objective to end HIV, TB and Malaria.

South East Asia

TBA

UNAIDS

Since this Board last met, in June 2026, 149 Member States have adopted a new and ambitious Political Declaration on HIV/AIDS that is grounded in the new Global AIDS Strategy 2026-2031 and 2030 global HIV/AIDS targets. This 2026 Political Declaration sets out the global priorities, targets and actions that will guide the HIV response over the next five years and accelerate progress towards ending AIDS as a public health threat by 2030 and sustain the progress beyond.

At a time of geopolitical uncertainty, this renewed overwhelming commitment provides the foundation for the next phase of the global HIV response. The 55th Global Fund Board Meeting provides one of the first opportunities for the Global Fund partnership to translate these commitments into strategic, operational and investment decisions and actions that will shape country implementation over the coming years.

The operating environment has become increasingly complex. Countries are navigating constrained financing, shifting priorities, increasing humanitarian and public health pressures, in many settings, a more challenging policy environment for communities, civil society, human rights and gender, and an evolving global health architecture. Rapid scientific advances—including long-acting HIV prevention and treatment options, improved diagnostics and digital innovations—create an unprecedented opportunity to accelerate progress, provided countries have equitable access, sustainable financing and the implementation capacity to translate innovation into population-level impact.

This Board therefore marks an important transition—from agreeing the strategic direction for Grant Cycle 8 to creating the conditions for its successful implementation, while protecting progress achieved through Grant Cycle 7. Our collective challenge is to translate renewed global commitments into measurable impact by making increasingly difficult strategic choices, prioritizing the interventions with the greatest epidemiological impact and ensuring that every available resource delivers maximum value for people living with and affected by HIV.

As the Board considers the agenda over the coming days, the UNAIDS Constituency encourages the partnership to remain focused on these overarching questions:

- How do we protect HIV gains and maximize impact in an increasingly constrained financing environment?
- How do we strengthen country leadership, sustainability and resilience while tackling the inequalities that continue to drive vulnerability, risk and unequal access to services, ensuring that no one is left behind?
- How do we ensure that scarce resources are directed to the interventions, populations and places where they will have the greatest epidemiological impact
- How do we ensure that a more integrated global health ecosystem delivers better outcomes for countries and communities without diluting the impact that the focused HIV response has had?

To guide our engagement throughout the 55th Board Meeting, the UNAIDS Constituency will focus on six strategic priorities that reflect both the 2026-2031 Global AIDS Strategy and the commitments of the 2026 Political Declaration - that focus on implementation and accountability:

- Protect HIV gains and deliver on the commitments of the Global AIDS Strategy and Political Declaration by ensuring that Grant Cycle 8 investments sustain progress towards ending AIDS, safeguarding HIV treatment continuity, scaling prevention and essential HIV services

despite an increasingly constrained financing environment.

- Support country leadership, self-reliance and respect for country sovereignty by strengthening national ownership across planning, implementation, procurement and financing, enabling countries to make difficult strategic choices using the best available data and scientific evidence, while building resilient and sustainable HIV responses.
- Put communities at the centre of the response by protecting human rights, safeguarding civic space, investing in community leadership in the design, delivery and monitoring of quality HIV services, and maintaining an enabling legal and policy environment for equitable access to HIV prevention and treatment services
- Advance integrated, people-centred health systems that improve efficiency and sustainability while ensuring that integration strengthens—rather than dilutes—the effectiveness, accountability and measurable impact of the HIV response.
- Advance sustainable and resilient national responses by supporting stronger domestic financing, equitable access to medicines, diagnostics and innovations, including new prevention technologies, local production and manufacturing, resilient procurement and supply systems, and long-term transition planning.
- Promote coordinated multilateral action by aligning technical support across partners and sectors, leveraging comparative advantages, preserving the unique strengths of a multisectoral HIV response and ensuring countries receive coherent, efficient and country-centred support.

The Global Fund has repeatedly demonstrated its ability to evolve while remaining steadfast in its mission. The UNAIDS Constituency looks forward to working with all Board constituencies, the Secretariat and partners to ensure that the commitments renewed through the new Global AIDS Strategy and 2026 Political Declaration are translated into partnerships and implementation that protect HIV gains, strengthen country leadership and ownership, and accelerate progress towards ending AIDS as a public health threat by 2030.

European Commission, Belgium, Italy, Portugal, Spain

European Constituencies wish to reaffirm our strong appreciation and support for the Global Fund's work at this time of significant change and uncertainty in the global health landscape. The Global Fund's partnership model and its results in the fight against HIV, TB and malaria remain more relevant than ever. As the organisation adapts to a shifting operating environment, we encourage the Global Fund to play an active and constructive role in the various ongoing reform processes, the WHO-hosted process and the Accra Reset, to help shape a coherent future global health architecture. In doing so, we underline that the hard-won gains of the past two decades must be preserved and protected throughout any process of reform or transition.

4. Update by the Executive Director

World Health Organization

The WHO thanks the Executive Director for the progress update, including the GC8 early observations. The GC8 strategic shifts – notably those towards prioritization and integrated programme delivery – respond to significant recent changes in the global health eco-system and financing, and are especially important for sustainability and transition pathways. Looking ahead, these will also be important considerations in the Global Health Architecture reform process.

Canada, Switzerland and Australia

The Global Fund is confronting numerous pressures as it advances Grant Cycle 8 including tightening fiscal space and reduced country allocations; climate change; deliberate efforts to undermine human rights; diminished capacity of technical partners; and an internal reorganization while operationalizing strategic shifts. To mitigate risks and achieve the

greatest impact possible, we need to ensure that the organization has clear direction, agility, timely guidance, and a strong focus on enabling country leadership, with equity remaining central to its engagement.

Equitable and successful transitions and CRG should be prioritized

In such a context, difficult decisions and trade-offs will be required – by the Global Fund, countries and partners. **For CSA, supporting sustainable, successful and equitable transitions should remain a central priority.** We share the OIG concerns that transition timelines may outpace system readiness, particularly for key and vulnerable populations. Ensuring adequate Secretariat capacity to support country transition is critical. We remain concerned that resources may be insufficient to effectively achieve context-specific transition pathways and encourage the Secretariat to carefully weigh the implications of internal restructuring for both OPEX and transition outcomes. Getting the balance right will be essential to protect hard-won gains.

As transitions are implemented and post-transition planning advances, the Global Fund must equip itself with the appropriate tools to effectively monitor implementation and track progress. Well-defined key performance indicators (KPIs) are essential to ensure the Board is adequately positioned to provide strategic guidance and enable timely and effective course correction where needed.

CSA also wishes to reaffirm its longstanding support for the centrality of Community, Rights and Gender (CRG) within the Global Fund model. It is essential that CRG priorities remain adequately resourced. Decisions related to OPEX and associated trade-offs should explicitly recognize the risks of underinvestment in these areas.

Leaning on the partnership

We believe one of the Global Fund's core strengths is its partnership model, which it must safeguard and actively draw upon as it navigates change. As the global health ecosystem evolves, the Global Fund must remain actively and strategically engaged, particularly with those closely aligned with the Global Fund's core mandate. We underscore the importance of Global Fund's active participation in the WHO-hosted joint process, which will require strong technical engagement to inform recommendations to governing bodies.

As the Global Fund contributes to efforts to evolve the global health ecosystem and reflects on its own evolution, **we encourage the Secretariat to show boldness and humility:** to assert its clear comparative advantages – community engagement, market shaping, inclusive governance – while also recognizing where others may be better positioned to lead, and where a recalibration of engagement could help reduce duplication and fragmentation. In a context of constrained resources and difficult internal trade-offs, it will be critical that this prioritization is undertaken with transparency and honesty. The Gavi-Global Fund collaboration agenda should move ahead with a narrowed focus and to clearly articulate the tangible impacts that can be achieved at the country level, particularly in relation to malaria and TB. Cycle alignment between Global Fund and Gavi should receive consideration as a way to create greater impact and reduce transaction costs on countries. Cofinancing opportunities with the World Bank are a way to enable country ownership, integrated service delivery, and sustainable financing.

For CSA, pooled procurement is a key comparative advantage of the Global Fund. It is critical to increasing access to affordable, quality assured drugs and other commodities, and for enabling rapid uptake at scale of new innovations. We think it is a strategic priority to enable increased non-Global-Fund-financed procurement via wambo.org. In the face of current financial headwinds in global public health, it is vital for countries transitioning away from or ineligible for Global Fund support to have access to the benefits of pooled procurement.

Now is also the time for the Board to be reflecting on how the organization can and should evolve in light of the evolving global health context and as we approach the development of the next Global Fund strategy.

Ensuring efficient governance

CSA encourages the Secretariat to make full and strategic use of the Global Fund's governance structures. Ensuring that committees and the Board are operating at the right strategic level and are effectively leveraged will be critical to provide clear direction and enable timely course correction where needed. The Secretariat should lean on committees as proposals are developed, while the Board should focus on informed decision-making and

providing strategic steer.

Looking ahead, we believe that the Global Fund governance should ensure it meets the moment. This requires more agility and a greater focus of the Board on strategic direction and decision-making. To support this, it is essential that Board members are provided with clear, concise, and decision-oriented materials that enable evidence-based deliberation and informed strategic steer. It is also important that Board retreats focus on key strategic issues, to help inform Board deliberations.

As changes unfold, within and around the Global Fund, transparency and communication will be critical to sustaining trust during this period of change. We encourage the Secretariat and the Coordinating Group to ensure prompt and regular reporting to – and engagement with – Board members, including through updates between formal Board meetings where appropriate. At the same time, we encourage Board members to prioritize strategic oversight over operational details, and remain mindful, in a constrained environment, of the cumulative demands placed on the Secretariat, ensuring resources are focused on implementation and impact. CSA stands ready to support explicit and strategic deprioritization decisions alongside the Board.

CSA looks forward to continued collaboration as we collectively navigate these challenges and support the effective implementation of GC8.

Japan /Republic of Korea

- The current global health landscape is at a significant turning point. Investment in strengthening resilient health systems, which is the foundation for addressing HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria, is becoming more crucial than ever, as we need to sustain the past achievements while progressively and effectively transitioning away from external funding in each country. As one means to support transitioned countries, we welcome the proposal to expand Non-GF Financed Procurement (NGFP).
- There is an ongoing discussion on the global health architecture (GHA) reforms and its future direction. We welcome the re-evaluation of the Global Fund's strengths in addressing HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria, and the reaffirmation of its role within the ecosystem in this Board Meeting. Given limited resources, eliminating duplication among various global health initiatives and strengthening collaboration is essential to maximize impact in implementing countries.
- Global health is a critical issue that impacts economic, social, and security risks. We re-emphasize that the Global Fund is an extremely effective and crucial partner in the fight against HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria as well as health system strengthening. However, we should continuously re-evaluate the Global Fund's position and its added value within the broader review of the entire GHA. Also, the Global Fund should constructively collaborate with relevant organizations and initiatives, including the WHO-led GHA reform process.

United Kingdom

Ahead of the 8th Replenishment, the Global Fund responded to demands for change through the GC8 Strategic Shifts. These secured a strong replenishment outcome and a more effective and sustainable approach to ending AIDS, TB and malaria. As the global health landscape changes, we must show the same ambition in how the institution evolves, while maintaining a relentless focus on the countries and communities the Fund serves.

The model that brought us here must evolve to meet the moment. The Fund must change in ways that are practical, proportionate and focused on delivering impact, while responding to and shaping wider evolution. To this end, we welcome Global Fund participation in the WHO joint process and proportionate engagement with other reform processes and dialogues. Our goal should be to better support countries to strengthen primary and community health systems through integrated, sustainable and resilient approaches, while sustaining access for key and vulnerable populations. This is also an opportunity for the Global Fund to adopt a more differentiated approach that reflects the diversity of country contexts. As donors and Board members, we must also be willing to embrace change ourselves.

The UK:

Supports the twin track approach to reducing **OPEX costs** to ensure limited resources are focused on greatest impact. We would urge Track 2 to protect country facing delivery of the Strategic Shifts, particularly resources supporting: integration to strengthen primary health care systems, sustainability (transition, co-financing), country- impact focused global health architecture reform, gender and human rights, and climate and health. We support greater differentiation across country portfolios and the reclassification of CCM funding.

Welcomes the timely proposals on **Governance Effectiveness**. We agree with the intent to focus the Board more on strategic decisions, to offer more genuine choices and trade-offs, and to reduce duplication with Committees. We encourage a proportionate and practical approach, including streamlined, concise Board and Committee materials, better action tracking and greater use of AI to reduce burden and increase transparency. We greatly value implementing country, civil society and communities voice in the Board and are open to proposals on how this might be sustained and strengthened. We see a need for evolution of representation alongside country transition and, as they grow in importance, a non-voting space for regional bodies. We welcome approaches to joint governance with partner institutions and commit to doing our part in reducing pressure on the Secretariat.

We welcome the policy change on **Non-Grant Financed Procurement**, which could increase access to products and support country transitions. Impartial, equitable access will be key to this function playing a role in the future architecture. However, we believe the safeguards outlined are currently insufficient to ensure value for money and protect against market distortion and supplier concentration. Checks and balances must be exercised at the Strategy Committee, not the Executive Director, level and greater transparency in reporting is required to enable the Committee to exercise those safeguards effectively. We also note that significant increases in procurement volumes will require robust, regular risk assessment of the full supply chain to ensure effective demand forecasting and onward delivery – we would be grateful for further detail on how these risks are assessed and mitigated, including working with partners such as the World Bank. We note the importance of supporting regional and national manufacturing as the platform develops.

We support the revised **risk appetite framework and the revised appetite statements** and welcome timely escalation to Committees where risk appetite may be exceeded.

We support the changes to the **Evaluation Function** and swift implementation. The model should generate learning and evidence that lands in decision windows and shapes choices at all levels. We remain uncomfortable with the prominence of OIG input; this process-focused assurance function provides useful evidence on outputs but is not a substitute for outcome- and impact-focused assessment. We encourage the Secretariat to formalise independence and robust assessment of evidence in the model, including through appointing an independent evaluation expert to the Strategy Committee and an equivalent function to support the Secretariat.

We appreciated the joint briefing and welcome further discussions on the **Global Health Ecosystem** and **Gavi–Global Fund Collaboration**. We provided greater depth on our expectations in our joint donor statement ahead of the briefing but reiterate that improving country experience must remain the central objective. Collaboration must be focused on joint country engagement, integration of grant cycle processes and joint delivery on TB and malaria, including shared delivery of TB vaccines. We would welcome joint reporting to both Boards, greater ambition ahead of GC9, and options for cycle alignment to be considered by Committees in October.

Developed Country NGO

The Global Fund demonstrates its value-add, credible and effective role in the overarching global health ecosystem by its enormous, demonstrated impacts on the tens of millions of lives saved. **We must continue to protect and build on the gains that donors have invested in if we are to secure the GF's mission and define the next strategy to end HIV, TB and malaria.** The Board-approved strategic shifts for Grant Cycle 8 (GC8) focus on strengths that sustain grant financing in resource limited settings, catalyze scientific

innovations, and maintain a core post-transition function for the GF. Yet the Global Fund's strong governance has been fundamental to its successful track record, compared to other GHIs. In this time of difficult tradeoffs, the Partnership should remain vigilant that efforts **to reduce governance roles in the name of operational or governance "efficiencies" do not undermine the governance structures that have been central to the Partnership's success.**

The 55th Board meeting documents repeatedly express how essential community systems are to sustainability, equity, transition and impact but the mitigation plans and risk framework do not appear to give CSS the same level of visibility, protection or operational visibility as commodities, market shaping, and financial controls. **BM55 includes sessions where the importance of community responses and systems strengthening (CRSS) and community engagement are prominent themes, yet we believe there is insufficient time to support and promote discussions in a cross-cutting way**— and we see a lot missing or underweighted across the papers. CSS is inside the ORR risk definition but thinly described in the mitigation plan as the response focuses more on human rights / gender programming and little on CSS implementation, financing, social contracting, community-led monitoring (CLM), data integration or building community leadership infrastructure. At the same time, CSS performance problems are acknowledged – the KPI shows only 22% of countries with maturing / strong community systems – but this is not clearly escalated from potentially being a performance issue. It is a strategic risk, especially if GC8 and sustainability depends on community systems financing through newer models such as social contracting to support CSS in transition. Looking again at the lackluster KPI results, to date, the CELO report says TB and malaria modules lack KPIs directly relevant to measuring community responses and that community contributions and sub-national decision-making are not being captured in monitoring systems – which could mean CSS is “underperforming” partly because it is under-measured, or harder to defend during prioritization.

Part of the overall approach that seems to be the suggested shift across BM55 papers is simplification, prioritization and streamlined grant and other processes. In principle, these are reasonable approaches individually. However, CSS requires more deliberate processes with meaningful participation and relationship-building and is exactly the kind of work that can be lost on the altar of “simplification.”

Therefore, as noted under the Risk Matters agenda item, **we are left questioning whether it is appropriate to approve the Updated Risk Appetite Framework Decision Point that puts Program Risk as “tolerant” while the evidence indicates that CSS programs remain fragile and not being fully operationalized, with much of the work continuing to rely on strategic investments.**

The Developed Country NGO Delegation looks forward to the dedicated session by the Executive Director to update the Board and share early analysis on the trends and gaps seen in the Window 1 funding requests for GC8. Implementers in our Delegation have highlighted many observations and we welcome an opportunity to discuss how to potentially address these concerns in time for Windows 2 and 3, and looking ahead to country transition planning in GC8 (and GC9):

- Direction of travel: Consolidation, integration and fewer implementation layers – We are seeing a clear direction of travel in GC8 towards more consolidated implementation arrangements, greater integration across disease components and RSSH, and fewer parallel grant-management structures. This is being framed around value for money, reduced fragmentation, lower transaction costs, stronger integration of services and more flexible use of limited resources. In several settings, there is a visible Secretariat preference for integrated grants, fewer Principal Recipients (PRs) and stronger alignment with government-led systems – regardless of the preference articulated by the CCM and/or country government. It is no longer simply who is best placed to manage a particular disease component, but increasingly whether the overall implementation model is seen as sufficiently integrated, efficient, risk-managed and sustainable.
- Program impacts due to late guidance and compressed timelines – The timing of the new guidance is creating real pressure on countries, PRs, and partners. This risks shifting

important program decisions into a late-stage technical and financial exercise, rather than allowing them to be shaped through full country dialogue and careful program design, with meaningful inclusion of civil society and communities. We would appreciate further information from the Secretariat on how it is addressing concerns about the operational deliverability of Window 1 programs once late budget adjustments, staffing changes, partner restructuring and revised implementation models are taken into account.

- Trade-offs – Implementers in our Delegation are seeing core GC8 trade-offs as between consolidation and continuity. The trade-offs create risks where the priorities most easily deferred are those requiring sustained community presence, tailored delivery models, or longer-term investments in trust and human rights. A single integrated grant may offer more flexibility to reallocate savings or respond to changes in implementation. However, this can place disease-specific, community-led, gender-responsive and rights-based interventions into more direct competition with commodities, procurement, supply-chain costs, health-product management and other high-cost priorities. We must ensure the priorities which are least protected by hard delivery targets will retain sufficient budget, ownership and visibility once reprogramming begins.

- Implications for civil society and community implementation – The most cost-effective investments in the HIV, TB and malaria responses are increasingly shortchanged. We are concerned that civil society and community implementers may be shifted from strategic grant leadership roles into narrower delivery or subcontracting roles. This reduces the influence of communities and civil society over program design, resource allocation, performance management, and accountability. And there are particular consequences for key population programming, community-led monitoring, human rights work, stigma reduction, gender-based violence response, and demand generation activities. More centralized implementation models cannot easily replicate the distinctive value that CSOs and CLOs bring (while also risking the decimation of community networks that have taken decades to build) – i.e., trust, proximity to affected communities, the ability to reach underserved groups, and an independent role in accountability.

- Human rights, gender and community systems risk being pushed to the margins – Human-rights and community interventions are integral to program impact by enabling people to seek testing, initiate prevention, remain in treatment, navigate stigma and discrimination, report violence, access services safely and hold systems accountable. At the same time, human rights interventions can appear in a grant narrative while remaining underfunded, weakly operationalized, insufficiently monitored, or highly exposed to later reprogramming. Our Delegation members are seeing signs that human rights investments may be facing substantial reductions in some settings. For example, in one country grant, the human rights budget was reduced from more than EUR 10 million in the previous cycle to just over EUR 3 million in GC8. That is not a marginal efficiency adjustment. It risks materially weakening the ability of communities and civil society to address legal barriers, stigma, discrimination, gender-based violence, key population access, and accountability for service quality.

- Innovation in the funding requests – Across the funding requests Delegation members reviewed, innovation is present but takes different forms. Innovation in GC8 is no longer limited to introducing new products: It increasingly combines biomedical tools, differentiated service delivery, digital systems, integrated diagnostics, community platforms and new approaches to financing and accountability. Not all forms of innovation are equally easy to protect in a constrained budget environment. New commodities and technical tools may be more visible and easier to cost through the Health Product Management Template (HPMT) and product budgets. By contrast, innovations related to community systems, demand generation, rights-based access, social protection, and accountability may be less visible in the budget but are often critical to whether biomedical innovations actually reach the people who need them most. Re: Window 1 submissions: Are countries financing innovation as a complete package, including the delivery, rights, demand, and accountability conditions required for uptake, or are they primarily financing the product itself?

- Implications for shared costs and implementation capacity – Shared costs are no longer treated as a separate budget line or as a general overhead allocation. Costs that were previously recovered through shared-cost mechanisms now need to be demonstrated as direct costs linked to specific grant functions, such as human resources, finance,

procurement, IT, office management, supervision, partner management, reporting, or audits. This requires much more granular budget design and stronger justification. Implementers will need to demonstrate the direct contribution, cost basis and value added of each cost category. For country offices and civil society partners, this creates a potential financial cliff. Essential functions may no longer be recoverable unless they can be clearly linked to direct grant implementation. This is especially important for smaller local organizations, which may have less flexibility to absorb unrecovered costs and less capacity to manage more complex documentation requirements.

- Wider strategic concerns – We continue to raise serious concerns on country ownership and process legitimacy. Where the Secretariat or GMD is strongly shaping implementation arrangements, this may be understandable in the context of risk, performance or safeguards. However, it can also create tension around the authority of CCMs, the credibility of country dialogue, and the balance between national decision-making and Secretariat influence. Other concerns are raised in the Risk Management sessions, including the narrowing of civil society space; transition risks; budget realism and not stripping out essential operational functions; cumulative nature of the pressures (e.g., reduced allocations, late guidance, etc.). This creates a much more fragile grant-making environment.

Our overarching position is that implementing CSOs support service integration, country ownership, and value for money. However, these objectives should not be pursued at the expense of service continuity, civil society leadership, human rights programming, strong governance, community accountability, or realistic implementation capacity.

West and Central Africa

The Eastern and Southern African and Western and Central African Constituencies (ESA and WCA) recognise that the Global Fund is entering one of the most challenging periods in its history. Declining official development assistance, increasing geopolitical uncertainty, and growing expectations for country ownership require the partnership to make difficult choices—all while remaining firmly focused on its core mission of saving lives.

The current financial environment also presents an opportunity. As resources become more constrained, the Global Fund will need new ways of working. The constituencies acknowledge the efforts taken by the Secretariat in this regard, particularly de-duplication, focusing limited resources on high impact activities, and simplifying the model. However, WCA and ESA call on the Secretariat and Board to hold all proposed changes to one critical principle: *How do these changes strengthen the country systems, programmes, and service delivery approaches that will prepare countries for transition ?*

Indeed, a major theme of this Board Meeting's agenda is the emphasis on our countries assuming greater responsibility for programme delivery, implementation and sustainability. ESA and WCA fully support this direction. However, greater country ownership and leadership cannot be achieved in a vacuum. The time is now for the Global Fund to contribute greater investments in the national systems, implementation capacity, and community leadership needed to successfully achieve this transition. Successful transfer of ownership cannot be achieved through the transfer of responsibility, without the corresponding transfer of the tools, capacity, and structures.

Western Pacific Region

On behalf of Fiji, the Western Pacific Region Constituency wish to express our profound disappointment that Fiji will continue on the path to transition after Grant Cycle 8, without the special consideration that was requested.

This decision does not reflect the reality on the ground. In only a few years, Fiji has moved from a low-level epidemic, through a concentrated epidemic, to a generalized epidemic. HIV prevalence now exceeds 2% among antenatal populations and more than 5% among key populations, with transmission continuing to accelerate. The Government of Fiji responded by calling a national outbreak, stood up an outbreak and cluster response taskforce, established a diagonal programme and increased funding from USD 89,000 in 2024 to USD 4.5 M in 2025.

Our traditional partners DFAT, MFAT and India immediately provided generous financial, technical and in-kind support, upwards of USD 10 M. Despite that the epidemic continues to outpace all efforts.

In 2025, Fiji recorded more than 2,000 new HIV diagnoses—the highest in its history. HIV-related deaths have increased more than fivefold since 2021. Only around one in five people living with HIV are receiving treatment, and harm reduction services remain unavailable despite injecting drug use now being the leading identified route of transmission.

These are not the characteristics of a country ready for transition. They are the characteristics of a country facing a public health emergency.

This is also not a new concern. At the 54th Board Meeting, the Western Pacific Constituency urged the Board and the Secretariat to recognize **transition failure as a strategic risk**, highlighting Fiji's rapidly evolving epidemic as an early warning of the consequences when transition pathways do not adequately reflect changing epidemiological realities.

Unfortunately, that warning has now become reality. We therefore renew our call for transition failure to be explicitly recognized and managed as a strategic risk within the Global Fund's risk framework.

Fiji's situation also has implications beyond its national borders. As a regional education and transport hub, Fiji is closely connected with neighbouring Pacific island countries. An uncontrolled HIV epidemic in Fiji has the potential to affect the wider Pacific region, underscoring the need for a regional perspective when assessing transition decisions for Small Island Developing States.

We recognize the difficult choices facing the Global Fund in a constrained financial environment. However, strategic prioritization must also remain responsive to rapidly changing epidemics. We therefore respectfully urge the Secretariat to keep the door open to reconsidering Fiji's circumstances and to work with the Government of Fiji and partners to identify a path forward that reflects the scale and urgency of the current epidemic.

The Western Pacific Region Constituency remains committed to working with the Secretariat, the Board, and our partners to ensure that Fiji's situation becomes an example - not of transition failure, but of the Global Fund's ability to respond with agility, partnership, and solidarity when countries face unforeseen and rapidly evolving public health threats. We urge the Board not to leave Fiji—or the Pacific—behind.

South East Asia

TBA

UNAIDS

Please refer to the overall opening comments delivered by the UNAIDS Constituency and to the statement of our Deputy Executive Director.

Point Seven

Point Seven would first like to acknowledge and commend the Global Fund's willingness to adapt in an increasingly constrained operating environment. At a time of significant changes in the global health architecture and funding landscape, the Fund has continued to demonstrate resilience and a strong commitment to delivering on its mission to combat HIV, tuberculosis and malaria.

We would like to clearly acknowledge and appreciate the Fund's willingness to evolve and adapt during the current Grant Cycle in response to a rapidly changing operating environment. We are encouraged by the strong conversion of both the Seventh and Eighth Replenishments into grants and programmes, and by the continued delivery of essential services despite funding disruptions and an increasingly complex risk landscape.

We also recognize that the continued delivery of essential services is a testament to the strength of the Global Fund partnership. Progress depends not only on the Fund itself, but also on the commitment and collaboration of governments, communities, civil society organizations, implementers, and other partners working together to reach those most in

need.

At the same time, we note with concern the uneven progress in strengthening community systems. We encourage continued efforts to accelerate the removal of human rights- and gender-related barriers to services and to ensure that programmes effectively reach populations that are underserved, marginalized, and most at risk. Sustained attention to these areas will be critical to safeguarding impact and ensuring that no one is left behind.

While we welcome the encouraging results highlighted in the report, we cannot ignore the fact that the world remains off track to end the three diseases by 2030. We therefore view these early observations as an important call to action. The challenges facing the partnership are significant and require both realism and ambition in equal measure.

Point Seven stands ready to be part of this response. As a constituency and as long-standing, committed donors to the Fund, we recognize that adaptation will be necessary at all levels. We are prepared to evolve alongside the Fund and support efforts that strengthen effectiveness, protect hard-won gains, and maximize impact in a constrained resource environment.

5. Coffee

South East Asia

N/A

UNAIDS

NA

6. Risk Matters

Eastern Mediterranean Region

The EMRC endorses the Risk Appetite Framework and the three proposed statements. The architecture is sound and represents genuine governance progress. Our concern — unchanged from SC30 — is the structural gap between the Level 1 appetite the Board sets and the Level 2 Risk Positions Management uses to operationalize it. Approving a "Tolerant" stance for Program Risk without visibility into the Level 2 guidance that defines tolerable variability in portfolios serving Yemen, Sudan, Afghanistan and other Challenging Operating Environment (COE) settings is a transparency deficit with direct country consequences. In COE and fragile settings, where surveillance systems may be weak, populations highly mobile and service delivery partly humanitarian-dependent, ambiguity can lead to inconsistent grant implementation, risk-averse programming, under-detection of TB and malaria, delayed procurement, treatment-continuity risks and reduced community outreach. We request to explicitly differentiate COE and fragile contexts, define acceptable thresholds and mitigation expectations for programmatic deviation, and be reported alongside Level 1 statements as a standing governance requirement, beginning at SC31.

We also note that the Risk Register's "Steady" characterization of Co-financing and Transition risk sits uncomfortably alongside KPI R1a at 76% and R1b at 58% against an 85% target. Aggregate performance may mask more acute constraints in conflict-affected and fiscally distressed EMRC countries. The risk methodology should distinguish policy non-compliance from structural inability to meet co-financing commitments where fiscal collapse, sanctions,

humanitarian dependence or limited domestic revenue constrain performance. We request that the Risk Office address this directional assessment explicitly. We also ask that the three deferred Risk Appetite Statements — Strategic Risk, Secretariat Operations, and Ethics/Legal/Governance — be accelerated and brought before the Board before the relevant GC8 implementation decisions are finalized. The Board cannot responsibly assess whether GC8 operationalization sits within approved institutional tolerance when a third of the enterprise risk appetite remains unapproved.

Japan/Republic of Korea

- We support the proposed amendment of Risk Appetite Framework and Risk Appetite Statements presented by the Secretariat as this is based on a sound assessment and direction, particularly given the current uncertain and resource-contained environment. In particular, the proposed direction of strategically accepting risks rather than entirely avoiding them is a pragmatic and necessary approach given the recent funding constraints.
- We appreciate that this framework will serve as a crucial basis for enhancing the transparency and consistency of future decision-making. We look forward to its concrete operationalization and will continue to closely monitor its effectiveness.

Communities

The Communities Delegation appreciates the work of the Risk Management team. We note that the framework does not propose a distinct risk appetite statement for human rights and gender-related barriers to access. We are not asking the Board to define a formal “appetite” for this risk in the same terms as Program or Financial risk: these are not risks we choose to accept in pursuit of impact, they are risks we are obligated to eliminate. But the absence of a named appetite must not become an absence of visibility. A risk left out of the taxonomy can quietly disappear from indicators, thresholds, and Board reporting altogether, so we ask that human rights and gender-related barriers be explicitly and regularly monitored, with defined indicators and escalation pathways, tracked with the same discipline as financial and fiduciary exposure rather than assumed away as a background condition of “complex implementation environments.”

This matters because the Program Risk Appetite Statement asks the Board to accept that uneven institutional capacity “increases the likelihood of stock-outs, service disruptions, suboptimal performance, and weakened oversight,” and to accept “higher short-term risks to enable sustainable long-term impact.” We understand the necessity of risk-informed trade-offs; however, with the HIV, TB and malaria responses already off track against our 2030 commitments, we are not yet convinced that there is a well-planned pathway from short-term risk to long-term gain, rather than a slide toward long-term instability. Rights and gender barriers are precisely the kind of risk that erodes quietly, surfacing only once access has already been lost: a stock-out is not simply a logistics failure, it is a driver of resistance. The Ethics and Governance Committee’s own observation that the organization’s risk posture is “increasingly fragile and reliant on sustained mitigation efforts” should push the Board toward more, not less, visibility into these under-measured risks. For malaria, LLIN distribution volumes cannot be read as a green light on their own; use, durability, and effectiveness in communities’ hands are the real measure of success.

This concern is not hypothetical. Community, Rights & Gender barriers to access to HTM services are now rated High and rising, with the Organizational Risk Register itself acknowledging that the global anti-rights and anti-gender backlash, combined with abrupt donor funding reductions, poses significant challenges to the sustainability of key organizations and to the Global Fund’s own ability to mitigate this risk. We welcome the planned review of catalytic investments as an important opportunity to strengthen support for removing human rights barriers, advancing gender equality, expanding services for key and vulnerable populations, and scaling up community-led interventions. However, we do not yet have an indication of request explicit transparency on future investment levels and priorities for human rights and gender programming, so this risk does not quietly shrink amid overall resource constraints.

We also welcome the Secretariat's stated intention to move human rights and gender from separate activities to core requirements across the entire grant lifecycle, but this shift in framing is only as strong as the funding architecture that supports it. We see it as an opening to go further: toward direct and sustainable funding for community-led organizations, particularly those working with key and vulnerable populations, who are consistently best placed to address human rights barriers, respond to emerging crises, advance gender equality, and reach the same populations most exposed when this risk is left unmitigated. If the Board is serious about community leadership as a mitigation for this risk, that intent must be matched by increased investment and simplified, direct funding pathways that let communities design, implement, monitor, and sustain these interventions themselves.

West and Central Africa

The ESA and WCA constituencies welcome the evolution of the Risk Appetite Framework and support the proposed decision point before the Board. Our constituencies believe that the revised framework provides an important foundation for the Global Fund as it navigates an increasingly constrained operating environment. The stronger emphasis on prioritization, explicit trade-offs, and strategic decision-making is both timely and necessary as the partnership enters Grant Cycle 8.

ESA and WCA support the proposed tolerant risk appetite for **Programme Risk and Health Product Access Risk alongside a cautious approach to Financial and Fiduciary Risk.**

As the Global Fund increasingly relies on national systems, we emphasise the importance of differentiation in implementation and assurance. Our constituencies would like to draw attention to fragile countries, notably the Challenging Operating Environments (COEs). COE countries, including those in our regions, have a significant need for greater support for their capacitation. In the context of the Global Fund's risk appetite, *how does the risk framework treat a COE country versus another country not COE? What kind of support is available to these countries to improve grant implementation? How will the Secretariat ensure that the revised Risk Appetite Framework translates into more differentiated implementation and assurance approaches, while continuing to provide countries with the support needed to manage these additional responsibilities?*

ESA and WCA believe the success of the revised framework will ultimately depend on whether it enables better decisions across the partnership. We continue to emphasise the fundamental importance of engaging national actors in risk matters, and we highlight past successes of this approach, such as in the engagement of program implementers, governments, and the CCM in risk identification and mitigation. When such an approach is taken, it improves the results.

We additionally acknowledge progress on the path of relying on national systems including those in accountability in many countries in our constituencies and providing them more support as part of the catalytic investments in Public Financial Management. We encourage the Global Fund Secretariat to continue on that path not only for sustainability reasons but also because those institutions have a deterrence power that the Global Fund Secretariat or OIG does not have. They can help mitigate the financial and performance risks.

South East Asia

UNAIDS

The UNAIDS Constituency welcomes the continued attention to enterprise risk management as the partnership enters GC8 in an increasingly uncertain global environment. Effective risk management is fundamental to protecting impact and ensuring that financial, operational and strategic risks are managed in a manner that safeguards health outcomes.

As the Global Fund navigates constrained resources, evolving global health architecture and increasing expectations on country ownership, we encourage continued attention to balancing financial stewardship with programmatic impact, ensuring that risk management enables

informed decision-making rather than limiting ambition.

6.1 Risk Management Report and Annual Opinion

Developed Country NGO

We reviewed the Risk Management Report and Annual Opinion with great interest and with a particular view toward informing country transition.

Our Delegation flags an absence of explicit focus and unclear description on accelerated transition, i.e., moving the highest impact GF grant interventions into publicly or country-financed systems. **We suggest elevating the transition risks**, which require more urgency, attention, and actionable steps taken across GC8 grant-making to mitigate – given how rapidly accelerated the transition timelines are.

Implementation of GF-financed programs go beyond the visibility of the public health sector, and we would expect the prioritization of policies and the sharing of guidance with the Board on the following:

- How phased transition planning would be fostered and enforced, while ensuring a managed shift of the Global Fund program into domestic systems. This process takes time and is highly context specific. Yet the main tenets can be defined and operationally monitored across the portfolio along a set of simple questions and indicators.
- Key milestones and targets that underpin the co-financing contracts, and how they are incentivized (as well as made conditional) in the grant agreements for GC8 and upcoming cycles. Government commitments on procurement are meaningless, disruptive and compromise program quality (as the OIG has often noted) if the system is unable to budget, procure, pay and deliver on time.
- The high-impact CSO and community-delivered health services, which are critical for program reach, often get excluded from government budgets, insurance schemes, and formal benefit packages. These services are essentially invisible in public finance systems and exposed to discontinuity in transition. Early, targeted action when preparing for transition can remedy this obstacle and ensure continuity in services.
- How the transition process includes a few suggested elements, such as:
 - Continuity in the key frontline services (both commodities and community service delivery), including the deliberate planning of the shift into domestic systems and through making these functions visible, costed and integrated. Communities and civil society representatives must meaningfully participate at the table at all levels. (Once these services have a visible route into domestic systems – with a budget line – accountability can last beyond donor funding).
 - Consideration of key planning questions: e.g., what (function), who (financial owner), how (pathway to funder), and when (timing and transitional cover).
 - Linking access enhancing services to existing national social and health indicators, on which the public authorities are accountable to local or national governments.
 - How the overarching GHI co-financing approach would evolve to be a main lever in assuring the transition to an infectious disease and Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (MNCH) function in the public system that is built on an evidence-based set of interventions and assures that integrated service delivery is suitable and effective for reaching marginalized communities, including key and vulnerable populations.

We must address these issues in a timely and sustained manner.

All key intervention areas must move on-budget – The timelines are shortening and particularly acute in the countries with a transition timeline to the end of GC8 and GC9, respectively: 63 disease components and 36 countries in GC8, and 24 disease components and 9 countries in GC9. With these accelerated timelines, it would be helpful to address:

- How is the Global Fund accelerating moving the key impactful community interventions on-budget? For example, how is full absorption of Community Health Workforce into the overall

primary healthcare workforce (PHC) planning “forced” in grant conditionalities for GC8?

- What is the policy on contingency planning when stockout risks materialize?
- Is the Public Financial Management (PFM) work of sufficient scale to shift fully ‘on-budget’ in a successful way within the selected countries and across the portfolio?

South East Asia

We appreciate the transparency of this report. The risks contained in 2025 were managed through measures the Report itself describes as extraordinary, and cautions may not be sustainable over the medium term. That caution should not be read as routine.

From the perspective of the SEA Constituency, the Report's description of co-financing and transition risk speaks directly to countries facing declining Official Development Assistance, rising debt servicing costs, and uneven domestic financing capacity. These are precisely the pressures the Report identifies as driving that risk to Very High. We are equally concerned by the Report's own caution that Program Implementation and Oversight, currently rated only Moderate, may understate actual exposure given the withdrawal of donor governance support in fragile settings.

We request that the Secretariat report at the next Audit and Finance Committee cycle whether 2025's mitigation measures are one-time or require continued extraordinary effort through 2026, as the Report does not yet make this distinction. We also request that the Program Implementation and Oversight rating be revisited once the effects of aid withdrawal become clearer, rather than remain at Moderate by default.

An elevated risk profile that persists beyond the point of extraordinary intervention is no longer an outlook. It is the baseline condition, and the Board should govern accordingly.

UNAIDS

The UNAIDS Constituency welcomes the Annual Risk Management Report and its continued evolution towards a more strategic and forward-looking approach to enterprise risk management.

The current operating environment requires increasingly difficult decisions. Financial constraints, geopolitical uncertainty, shrinking civic space, humanitarian crises and evolving country contexts require risk management approaches that support prioritization while protecting essential HIV services and equitable access to those services.

We particularly welcome the recognition of governance effectiveness as an enterprise risk and support continued efforts to ensure governance arrangements remain proportionate, efficient and focused on strategic oversight.

At the same time, we encourage greater alignment between the level of risk identified and the proposed management response. Where risks are assessed as high or increasing, a “business as usual” approach or general statements that mitigating measures are on track are not sufficient. Moderate confidence in existing mitigation measures should not preclude proactive and dynamic risk management. We encourage future reports to articulate more clearly the concrete actions being taken to respond to these evolving risks and to demonstrate how mitigation strategies are being adapted as circumstances change.

As countries begin implementing GC8, we encourage continued attention to risks affecting treatment continuity, prevention, community-led responses, supply security, human rights, civic space and sustainability. Risk management should remain adaptive, evidence-based and closely linked to protecting country impact.

Point Seven

Point Seven shares the Secretariat's assessment that risk materialisation is likely to increase in 2026, requiring greater risk acceptance and more explicit trade-offs. As highlighted in the EGC's input on the risk outlook, inclusive governance, trust, and transparency are essential—particularly when governance risk is considered an area where the Secretariat has significant mitigation capacity. Against this backdrop, Point Seven is emphasizing the urgent need to ensure that risks associated with transition are adequately mitigated. We request the Global Fund to clarify how it will work with countries to ensure that critical Global Fund-supported interventions are reflected in national plans and budgets. This should apply across the full spectrum of Global Fund investments, while recognizing that community, rights and gender (CRG) interventions may require particular attention given their greater vulnerability during transition. Increased domestic financing will be key, including for community-led interventions and organizations, which need to be adequately considered in transition planning.

6.2 Adjustments to Risk Appetite Statements

Latin America and Caribbean

Adjustments to Risk Appetite Statements

LAC Constituency supports the proposed amendments to risk appetite framework. Specifically, we endorse maintaining **atolerant appetite for Programme and Health Product**, while preserving **acautious stance toward Financial & Fiduciary Risk**.

We note with satisfaction structural improvement in the framework, particularly the establishment of a direct link between risk appetite and decision-making. Further, we welcome the enhanced monitoring capabilities introduced through specific risk indicators, thresholds, and clearly defined escalation pathways.

Moving forward, we recommend remaining highly vigilant to ensure that early signals of increasing risk exposure are identified and addressed in a timely manner.

World Health Organization

WHO notes the Global Fund's articulated tolerance for risk in access to medicines, and **underscores the importance of close collaboration with partners**, including WHO, **to safeguard continued access to quality-assured health products**.

The Global Fund and partners must ensure that the current context of rising medicine costs driven by geopolitical pressures, tariffs, supply constraints and logistics does not lead to an increased tolerance for risk regarding the quality of medicines and health products. While certain financial or operational risks will have to be appropriately managed, any shift towards increased risk tolerance on quality assurance could have broader implications across procurement systems so should be carefully avoided, with continued reliance on established mechanisms such as WHO Prequalification (PQ), the Expert Review Panel (ERP), and related quality assurance pathways.

Developed Country NGO

The Global Fund's updated Risk Appetite Framework is an important tool for the Global Fund for actively steering the risks that most threaten the organization's mission, strategy and credibility. It also provides clarity on the role of the Board in regard to enterprise level risk. However, the link between risk appetite and decision-making is still not clear and there needs

to be a clear escalation pathway. **We would also like to know how the taxonomy for Program Risk will be reported on, given the vast thematic scope within the Risk Appetite statement.**

We note that taken together, the risk papers reveal a significant shift in how the Secretariat is asking us as a Board to govern the organization – the GFS does not just identify risks, they are redefining the relationship between the Board, the Secretariat and the organization's relationship to risk itself. Resources – reduced replenishment, allocations, staffing and OPEX constraints, donor uncertainty, geopolitical instability are presented as new, structural conditions. Managing risk is becoming synonymous with prioritization and not an expansion of controls or mitigation: In other words, risk appetite management is becoming structural, with little suggestion from which the controls or mitigation could be transitioned.

Our Delegation is concerned that the Board is asked to own more of this trade-off with its accompanying push to permit the simplification of oversight and accept lower levels of assurance in lower priority areas, and which are presented as a structural shift and not a temporary mitigation of the risk approach. To our Board colleagues – particularly from donor countries – and as we begin early discussions for the next strategy to guide the Global Fund – our Delegation sees this as a reasonable approach from the Secretariat, even though we do not welcome the consequences of the approach. At BM55 and going forward, we will continue to question and oppose the outcomes that are at odds with the strategy we co-designed only a few years ago. However, the level of structural uncertainty that decreasing resources, increased expectations about sunseting organizations, and the increased questioning of the value of the global health ecosystem and its institutions places an incredibly high burden of operational uncertainty on an institution dependent on those funds to deliver its strategy.

At this Board meeting, we appreciate more clarity on the following areas:

- On the potential merging of the Risk and Ethics offices and functions: In practice, how does this make adjustments to the Risk Framework, how is it operationalized, and how is its implementation monitored, if the Decision Point is approved?
- On CRG, the proposed program risk appetite is “tolerant” but the ORR identifies CRG barriers as high and increasing, including community systems constraints. At the same time, the mitigation plan for CRG risk appears stronger on human rights and gender than on community systems strengthening. Given that KPI S4 shows only 22% of countries have maturing or strong community systems, how will CSS be explicitly reflected in risk indicators, thresholds and escalation pathways?

Communities

The Communities Delegation supports the Board's approval of the updated Risk Appetite Framework and the three Risk Appetite Statements presented for decision, and we recognize this as a genuine improvement on the 2018 residual/target risk structure. We do, however, want to flag a translation gap in how the framework is designed to operate that bears directly on what this approval means in practice: Risk Appetite is set by the Board, but it is then converted by management into Risk Positions that, per the framework, “do not require separate approval” by the Board. For risks that directly touch communities, service delivery, procurement affecting product availability, and in-country supply arrangements, this means the lived, practical version of “acceptable risk” is shaped by management judgment calls the Board never formally sees or votes on. As a condition of our support for this decision, we ask that the Board get regular, substantive visibility into how Risk Positions are being set under each of the three appetite statements being approved, not mere confirmation that they exist, so that “shared with the Board for transparency” becomes genuine oversight rather than a formality.

That same call for genuine oversight applies with particular weight to the Financial and Fiduciary Risk Appetite Statement. We support the cautious stance given the Global Fund's stewardship obligations, but we ask that this caution not become an unexamined brake on the

shift toward direct and simplified funding for community-led organizations that we and others have raised in the past. Fiduciary caution has historically been used to justify layered sub-granting arrangements that dilute community control without necessarily reducing real risk; the risk simply moves rather than disappears. As the Secretariat operationalizes this cautious appetite into Risk Positions for grant-related finance and fiduciary risk, we ask that it explicitly assess whether current fiduciary safeguards are calibrated to the actual risk profile of direct community funding, rather than defaulting to intermediary structures because they are more familiar, and that this assessment be shared with the Board rather than settled solely at the management level.

Western Pacific Region

WPC appreciates and endorses this new approach to address risk moving from risk avoidance to risk-informed decision-making. This is indeed a transformative governance approach; much needed in the ever-changing global context and the accelerated transition toward country ownership.

We would like to make the following recommendations:

- Policy must become country reality: The Secretariat must translate high-level Board appetite into clear, practical Risk Positions to guide local country portfolios.
- Data-driven tracking is required: The Global Fund must embed sharp risk indicators and real-time triggers into its tools to catch adverse trends before they breach approved boundaries.
- Clear escalation pathways are essential: Operational teams must adjust early when Level 2 thresholds are reached, and immediately push persistent enterprise threats up to Board Committees.

We would like to know whether and how this new risk appetite framework will be operationalized in GC8?

South East Asia

The most important feature of this paper is not the Risk Appetite levels themselves. It is the governance model behind them. The Board approves the Risk Appetite, but the Risk Positions that translate that appetite into day-to-day decisions are set by management and shared with the Board for transparency, not for approval. How those two levels work together in practice will determine whether this framework delivers its intended value.

From the perspective of the SEA Constituency, the operationalisation of Risk Positions will therefore be particularly important for implementing countries operating in diverse health system and financing contexts.

We ask the Risk Office to share draft Risk Positions for Program and Health Product Access Risk with constituencies before they take effect, not only through routine reporting after implementation, since the paper confirms these positions do not require separate Board approval.

We ask the AFC to confirm that, when the remaining Risk Appetite Statements return in October, the same early-sharing practice applies across all enterprise risks, not only to those presented.

The effectiveness of this framework will ultimately depend on whether the Board has sufficient visibility into how its approved Risk Appetite is translated into operational decisions. Greater transparency at that interface will strengthen both accountability and confidence in the framework.

UNAIDS

The UNAIDS Constituency supports the proposed refinements to the Risk Appetite Statements and welcomes continued efforts to ensure they remain aligned with the evolving operating environment.

As risk appetite evolves, it will be important to maintain an appropriate balance between fiduciary oversight, innovation and programmatic ambition. Risk tolerance should continue to reflect the Global Fund's mission, ensuring that efforts to manage financial and operational risks do not unintentionally limit equitable access, innovation or impact for the communities most affected by HIV, tuberculosis and malaria.

We encourage continued transparency regarding how revised risk appetite statements will inform operational decision-making throughout Grant Cycle 8.

Point Seven

Point Seven approves the decision point. Future risk mitigation will rely as much on governance as on operational risk controls. Reputational risks can undermine not only donor confidence, but also the confidence of communities and beneficiary countries in the Global Fund's ability to deliver its mission. Mitigating these risks requires strong and reliable governance mechanisms.

We stand behind a forward-looking approach to programmatic risks, particularly in light of recent increases in malaria incidence and projections suggesting that current trajectories may not be fully aligned with the 2030 targets. We welcome the tolerant standing to risks related to health product access, where disruptions affecting global supply chains have highlighted the importance of ensuring continuity and resilience in the delivery of health interventions.

At the same time, we welcome the cautious approach to financial and fiduciary risks, reflecting ongoing uncertainties related to exchange rate fluctuations, shifts in the donor landscape, geopolitical developments, and the broader global operating environment.

7. Lunch

South East Asia

N/A

UNAIDS

NA

8. GC8 (2027 - 2029) Strategy Costing (OPEX)

Latin America and Caribbean

GC8 (2027 - 2029) Strategy Costing (OPEX) - GF/B55/04 A&B

The LAC Constituency supports the overall direction of the proposed sequenced, two-track pathway to close the approximate US\$ 130 million structural gap and deliver within the approved US\$ 930 million aggregate forecast.

Track 1 (Early Action) will address roughly 55% of the gap (approx. US\$ 70 million) through controllable actions, including a one-time reclassification that realigns US\$ 31 million from CCM funding to Asset and Liability Management (ALM).

Track 2 (Continued Transformation) will close the remaining 45% of the gap (approx. US\$ 60 million) over Grant Cycle 8 (GC8) via an organizational review. This process aims to optimize how the Secretariat serves countries, fulfills GC8 priorities, and evolves into a more agile, future-fit institution.

LAC Position on CCM Funding Source Realignment

The LAC Constituency notes that the ~US\$ 31 million in CCM support is being reclassified out of the constrained Secretariat OPEX aggregate forecast. Instead, this funding will be sustained by optimizing the Asset and Liability Management (ALM) balance—managed entirely within the established ALM risk appetite—changing only the funding source. We observe that the Secretariat has built effectively on lessons learned from the current cycle, navigating increased uncertainty in funding sources to evolve its ALM management while maintaining robust safeguards and appropriate liability provisions.

Preserving CCM Independence LAC strongly welcomes the preservation of CCM independence. Ring-fencing these funds into a dedicated, segregated “Part B”; bucket within the ALM aligns perfectly with the CCM Funding Policy (2016). Because the total amount of CCM support and its direct funding agreement with the Secretariat are structured as an independent disbursement, they remain completely separate from country allocations, ensuring that CCM accountability structures remain unchanged.

Strategic Communication and Safeguards: LAC recommends attention to the Communication aspects of Early Action in Track1, given the critical importance of CCMs in the partnership model and the sensitivities that may be triggered. Moving forward, LAC recommends clearly communicating this funding source alignment. The messaging should emphasise that this change reflects a more coherent financial classification and does not compromise CCM integrity or long-term sustainability. Furthermore, it is critical to highlight that CCM funding will not compete with country allocations, which remain securely fixed at US\$ 10.78 billion for Grant Cycle 8 (GC8).

As for Track 2 Continued Transformation towards Secretariat fitness, LAC recommends the forthcoming accelerated transition be given appropriate consideration, in view of the likely rise of unprecedented scenarios, the need to assist transitioning countries, document the unfolding experience and inform the post-transition strategy.

World Health Organization

WHO welcomes the clarity provided in the document and underscores that any country allocations should be firmly anchored in country-led planning, and evidence-based decisions, to ensure that trade-offs **protect equity, quality of care and the needs of the most vulnerable populations**.

Sustaining gains under constrained resources will require continued focus on integrated, primary health care-oriented health systems – supported by sustainable domestic public financing. It also requires resilient supply chains for quality-assured medicines and health products, including strengthened regional and local manufacturing.

WHO stands ready to support countries and the Global Fund in **translating these strategic choices into sustainable and measurable health outcomes**.

Eastern Mediterranean Region

The Strategic Performance Report confirms the EMRC's concerns with precision. We are off-track against 2030 goals. Malaria incidence is rising — the first sustained reversal of trend in

over a decade — compounded by unexpected outbreaks in areas previously controlling malaria transmission. TB and drug-resistant TB also remain off-track in several fragile and conflict-affected settings, where weak surveillance, disrupted diagnostic networks, reagent shortages, treatment interruption and population displacement conceal the true burden and undermine progress toward the End TB Strategy targets. Between 2010 and 2024, new HIV infections globally declined by approximately 40% (from 2.2 million to 1.3 million annually), whereas in the Eastern Mediterranean Region this figure increased by 132%, rising from 31,000 to 72,000 annually. During the same period, global AIDS-related mortality decreased by 54% (from 1.4 million to 630,000 deaths), while in the Eastern Mediterranean Region it increased by 88%, from 12,000 to 23,000 deaths annually.

KPI S4, community systems strength, has declined to 22% of countries assessed as maturing or strong. Co-financing realization stands at 76% and in-country absorption at 69%, both materially below the 85% and 80% targets respectively. These aggregate figures do not capture the deeper financing and implementation constraints affecting conflict-affected, sanctioned and fiscally distressed EMRC portfolios. These are not incidental shortfalls. They are foundational conditions for GC8 sustainability and transition planning, and they are deteriorating simultaneously. At the same time, the experience of countries that have sustained programmatic performance while progressively increasing domestic financing should be systematically documented and shared. Such evidence can help countries entering similar transition pathways identify feasible sequencing, institutional safeguards and financing arrangements.

GF/B55/04A and GF/B55/04B present the OPEX framework within which every BM55 decision will be executed. The EMRC acknowledges the approved US\$930 million aggregate and supports Track 1 / Track 2 sequencing logic — with Track 1 early, non-workforce actions appropriately prioritized before any structural transformation under Track 2. Our concern is that front-loading Track 2 generates organizational disruption at a moment when GC8 implementation requires maximum Secretariat capacity. Three specific asks follow: first, CCM funding floors must be explicitly documented and maintained throughout the 2027–2029 pathway regardless of Track sequencing — any reduction in CCM operational capacity in COE and fragile settings is programmatically indistinguishable from a grant cut. Preserving both the financial and institutional capacity of CCMs should therefore be treated as a prerequisite for a successful and sustainable transition; second, the Board should request confirmation that COE and fragile operational premiums are protected within the US\$320–325 million 2027 budget range; third, no KPI measuring a GC8 strategic shift should be retired before a formally documented governance protocol — recording what the indicator measured, what decision-making it supported, and how the gap will be managed — is presented to and endorsed by SC31.

Japan/Republic of Korea

- The Strategy Costing for GC8 and proposed two-track financial pathway are appropriate, particularly given the current resource constraints. We find the framework, which combines “early action” with “structural transformation,” to be reasonable. We also generally support the phased approach to transitioning the operating model from the perspective of practical feasibility.
- At the same time, we are concerned that the continued constraints on OPEX and the resulting reduction in specialized staff capacity could directly affect the effective implementation of the Strategy. The Global Fund is strategically shifting its approach to support countries in making more effective use of limited resources by integrating responses to the three infection diseases into primary PHC and broader health systems, while strengthening country ownership and long-term sustainability. To successfully advance this strategic direction, it is essential to maintain adequate technical and strategic expertise within the Secretariat, including the appropriate deployment and retention of specialized staff who can effectively support countries in driving this integration.
- We must be mindful of the potential for the Secretariat’s discretion and scope of judgment to expand relatively due to the promotion of such flexible financial pathways and operating

model reforms. Specifically, risk-based prioritization and the redesign of country support models are likely to broaden the Secretariat's decision-making latitude. We believe it is crucial to ensure appropriate oversight by leveraging existing governance framework and ensuring transparency of key decision criteria and progress.

- Regarding the reallocation of CCM funds from OPEX to ALM, it is crucial to understand the potential impact of this change in funding source on the stability, predictability, and even the prioritization of fund allocation on the ground.
- On the reduction of LFAs (Local Fund Agents). We recognize the necessity of cost-cutting measures. However, we must raise a concern regarding the reductions to LFAs, who provide indispensable in-country oversight. Given the trade-offs are inevitable, we would welcome the Secretariat's honest assessment. Are these LFA budget cuts within the accepted risk tolerance?

Developed Country NGO

We appreciate the significant and difficult work behind the update provided on the OPEX evolution framework.

GC8 strategic shifts explicitly include **community systems and financing**. The OPEX paper says GC8 delivery must include transition pathways, prioritization, co-financing, market shaping, integration and community systems financing.

The Strategy Costing deck also frames one of the strategic choices in the following way: As more countries transition away from Global Fund grants, what is the Global Fund's role in supporting communities and civil society to remain engaged? Our Delegation agrees that this is the right question to ask but notes concern that the papers do not yet provide a strong answer. **In a constrained and/or lower OPEX environment, the risk is that CSS becomes everyone's stated priority but not an operationally protected function.**

We encourage additional exploration on the areas that the Secretariat views as rising risks in the gaps in technical capacity. The OIG has flagged this as an evolving risk in their annual report and, at this Board meeting, we would like further information on how this area will be addressed.

On the issue of using ALM for CCM funding (GF/BM55/04A, pp. 7-8), does this take away funding for the increasingly growing list of activities placed under PAAR? At first glance, USD 31 million may seem like a comparatively small amount. However, in Grant Cycle 7 (GC7) grants an estimated investment in Community Systems Strengthening (CSS) amounted to USD 104 million – while the majority of CSS activities are under PAAR. We are concerned about the uncertainty this creates, if there is a shortage in ALM (especially with the foreign exchange risks and gaps [p. 5]), and this could see cuts in country funding – further impacting CCM funding – and further marginalizing how civil society and communities engage in country dialogues.

There is also a great deal of technical assistance provided for CCMs. At this Board meeting, we would appreciate clarity and differentiation from where this funding comes in this scenario.

Communities

The Communities Delegation welcomes the Secretariat's transparency in laying out the structural drivers of the GC8 OPEX gap and the two-track pathway proposed to close it. However, we are concerned that the paper is heavily weighted toward the mechanics of cost containment and gives insufficient attention to how a reduced OPEX envelope will affect implementation results, grant performance, and the quality of country and community engagement. The Global Fund has committed to placing communities at the centre of its work, and this principle must anchor every trade-off made as the organization adapts to a tighter funding environment. When difficult choices must be made, we ask the Board and Secretariat to consistently focus on people and outcomes. The Global Fund's legitimacy rests on demonstrated impact, not on the efficiency of its OPEX ratio alone, and the strategy

costing pathway should be judged, first and foremost, against its effect on the people it is meant to serve.

That same test, effect on people first, applies to the specific mechanics of the paper. On the proposed realignment of ~US\$31M in CCM funding from OPEX to the ALM balance, we note the Secretariat's assurance that this is a reclassification and not a reduction. CCM funds must remain independent of grant/Principal Recipient accountability chains and must never compete with programmatic country allocations, now or as ALM pressures evolve. That said, moving funds "from one pocket to another" does not by itself strengthen CCM effectiveness, community representation, or inclusive decision-making. The delegation asks for a clearer articulation of how this change will actively improve, rather than merely preserve, community engagement and representation within CCMs. We further ask the Secretariat to set out a credible pathway toward greater CCM financial sustainability, including exploring domestic co-financing of CCM costs, particularly in countries transitioning away from Global Fund grants, so that CCM independence is underpinned by durable, diversified resourcing rather than reliance on a single ring-fenced allocation.

Beyond this specific reallocation, the delegation requests that the six residual risks identified in the paper, including loss of institutional talent, operational disruption, and the risk that short-term savings create latent long-term costs, be subject to genuine risk-mitigation accountability, not just naming. We ask that the Secretariat report to the Board and relevant committees against specific, pre-agreed control indicators for each risk, so that none of these risks is absorbed silently. Beyond this, we ask the Secretariat to develop and regularly report a dedicated set of indicators to track whether country support, quality, grant outcomes, and meaningful community engagement are maintained throughout the transformation, and to share them transparently with the Board to enable timely course correction if negative impacts emerge. Finally, we caution against an approach to Track 2 that treats the Secretariat as the sole source of intelligence on how support, assurance, responsiveness, and risk management should evolve. The scale of the funding reset demands genuinely new approaches, and communities are well placed to help co-design these options rather than simply respond to them after the fact. We ask that communities be structurally engaged in shaping Track 2 design choices, not only consulted once decisions are largely formed.

West and Central Africa

ESA and WCA recognise the significant affordability challenge facing the Global Fund and support the Secretariat's efforts to align its operating model with a more constrained financial environment. We agree that responding to these pressures requires structural transformation, rather than repeated incremental cost-cutting, and welcome the focus on simplification, prioritisation, and a more differentiated approach to country support.

ESA and WCA welcome the stronger emphasis on country ownership, sustainability and country systems. As countries assume greater responsibility for programme delivery, operating models, assurance arrangements, the Secretariat support should evolve accordingly. Transformation should not simply reduce costs; it should enable countries to lead more effectively. *How will the Secretariat ensure that changes to staffing, country support, and assurance strengthen country ownership while maintaining implementation quality, particularly in high-burden, transition and COE countries?*

ESA and WCA additionally support the proposed realignment of CCM funding from OPEX to ALM and the assurance that this represents a change in funding mechanism rather than a reduction in resources. We encourage the Secretariat to use this opportunity to further strengthen CCMs as governance bodies that support country ownership, oversight, and sustainability. Our constituencies encourage a more in-depth discussion of CCMs by the Board and Secretariat, notably to discuss CCM funding and positioning on the path to transition and post-transition, differentiating budgets and staffing by country context and the scale of implementation, and strengthening the engagement of national public actors within and beyond the CCM.

Western Pacific Region

The Western Pacific Constituency welcomes the proposed GC8 Strategy Costing and OPEX Pathway as part of the Global Fund's broader transformation. We see this as an opportunity not only to improve efficiency, but to reshape how the Secretariat supports countries in achieving sustainable impact. Transformation within the Secretariat should translate into tangible transformation at country level. Ultimately, the success of this transformation should be measured not only by financial efficiencies, but by stronger country systems and more sustainable health outcomes. We have the following recommendations:

- Transformation in Geneva must be translated into transformation in countries. The success of the transformation should be judged by what happens at the country level. The Secretariat's redesigned operating model, including Country Teams and Local Fund Agents (LFAs), should enable countries to strengthen ownership, accelerate implementation, prepare for transition, and build resilient health systems.
 - Protect country-facing capacity through differentiated support. Efficiency gains should not come at the expense of country-facing support. The Secretariat should protect functions that directly support implementation, particularly for Small Island Developing States (SIDS), transition countries, and countries with limited implementation capacity. A differentiated approach should remain a defining feature of the Secretariat's operating model to ensure equity and impact.
 - Shift from grant management to strategic partnership development. As countries assume greater responsibility for financing and managing programs, the Secretariat's role should evolve from grant administration toward multilateral system strengthening. This includes supporting policy dialogue, regional and domestic resource mobilization, transition planning, integrated health systems, and long-term sustainability. This task should be carried out using the power of the Global Fund Partnership. At the country level, the Secretariat should work closely with the government as well as technical and development partners (such as WHO, UNAIDS, World Bank, development agencies...) and other key stakeholders in a coordinated manner and build on the comparative advantage of each partner. This partnership should be formalized, regularly reviewed, and ready for responsive learning.
 - Modernize assurance for a higher-risk, higher-impact model. As the Global Fund adopts a higher programmatic risk appetite, assurance should also evolve. The Secretariat, LFAs, and OIG should spend less effort on routine compliance and transaction checking, and focus on facilitating and assessing: country ownership; partnership effectiveness; transition sustainability; and community leadership.
 - Invest in innovation while enhancing human partnership. The WPC supports the use of AI, automation, and streamlined processes to improve efficiency. However, technology should enhance—not replace—country engagement, strategic judgement, and trusted relationships with national and community partners. As we hope that the secretariat will play a critical role in facilitating successful transition through country-level partnership building, promoting country ownership, and supporting sustainable community engagement, in addition to all the interactions and interventions using innovative tools, we expect to see more, not less, in-person engagement on the ground. A leaner country team that spends less time on grant management and more on strategic discussions and facilitation, an LFA that spends less effort on auditing program transactions and compliance and more on monitoring strategic commitments will help deliver the transformation with this constrained OPEX.
- Measure transformation by country impact. WPC encourages the Secretariat to monitor transformation using indicators that go beyond OPEX savings, including: country satisfaction; implementation performance; transition readiness; sustainability of community systems; quality of country partnerships; and progress toward country ownership.

South East Asia

The financial pathway presented in the paper reaches the Board-approved US\$930 million OPEX envelope. The more important question is whether the twelve months of headroom created by Track 1 is sufficient for Track 2 to mature before it is needed, particularly because much of Track 2 still requires detailed design, feasibility assessment and implementation

decisions before the expected savings can be realised.

The papers make no reference to South-East Asia or any SEA country, so we draw no regional evidence from them. For implementing constituencies generally, this sequencing matters because country-facing oversight, LFA coverage and grant support are the capacities most exposed if Track 2 slips against the financial pathway already assumed.

We ask the Audit and Finance Committee to require that the Secretariat present, at AFC31, a detailed implementation plan for Track 2, including major design decisions, expected savings, timeline and associated risks, as a condition for confirming the 2027 OPEX budget.

We further ask the Secretariat to report against the six residual risks using specific, monitorable indicators ahead of the 2028–29 ALM checkpoint, so the Board can judge whether headroom is being consumed faster than transformation decisions are maturing.

UNAIDS

The UNAIDS Constituency recognizes the significant work undertaken by the Secretariat to develop options for a costed operating model that respond to the realities of a more constrained financing environment while supporting successful implementation of GC8. We appreciate the Secretariat's emphasis that the current exercise represents a structural evolution of the operating model rather than a series of short-term efficiencies. As the organization adapts, it will be essential that changes continue to protect the Secretariat's ability to support countries, maintain technical excellence, exercise oversight and deliver impact.

The operating model should enable countries to succeed – not simply enable the Secretariat to do more with less. Investments that strengthen country engagement, implementation support and coordinated technical support, market shaping, community systems and partnership coordination remain critical to achieving sustainable outcomes.

As implementation proceeds, we encourage continued transparency on how efficiencies are realized, how organizational changes affect delivery capacity, and how lessons from GC8 implementation can inform a sustainable operating model for GC9.

Point Seven

Point Seven chooses not to comment in light of the full constituency does not have access to all the pre-reading materials.

9. Closed Session

South East Asia

N/A

UNAIDS

NA

10. Coffee

South East Asia

N/A

11. Next Gen Market Shaping - Non-Global Fund Financed Procurement

Eastern Mediterranean Region

The EMRC strongly supports the NextGen Market Shaping framework and acknowledges the genuine achievements of GC7: accelerated Lenacapavir introduction across nine countries simultaneously, diversified first-line antimalarial access, and strengthened regional manufacturing pathways. These reflect a distinctive Global Fund capability that we support continuing and expanding. We also welcome the inclusion of newly recommended near-point-of-care (NPOC) and rapid molecular TB diagnostics within the Global Fund's market-shaping and procurement architecture. However, access in the EMR remains limited compared with other regions. We request an explicit regional access pathway covering product introduction, laboratory-network readiness, reagent continuity, maintenance, quality assurance, regulatory approval and last-mile deployment, particularly in high-burden, drug-resistant TB, refugee-hosting and COE settings.

Our support for the NGFP policy decision is conditional on four unresolved elements. First, there is not yet a sufficiently clear operational framework covering eligibility, governance, fees, payment arrangements, procurement prioritization, regulatory requirements, accountability and implementation timelines. Second, the uniform 1–5% fee structure, undifferentiated across the portfolio, transfers the proportionally heaviest cost burden onto the countries least able to bear it — Least Developed Countries (LDCs), fragile states, sanctioned and COE portfolios where procurement volumes are lower and fiscal space most constrained. Third, a pre-financing requirement without a funded and operational facility excludes precisely the transition and fiscally constrained countries the mechanism is designed to serve. Fourth, where products are supply-constrained, a sequencing model that systematically disadvantages NGFP self-financing buyers relative to grant-financed procurement creates a two-tier access outcome the policy does not address. These barriers are compounded in the EMR by national registration requirements, divergent regulatory timelines, foreign-exchange constraints, banking restrictions, import authorization and last-mile delivery limitations.

The EMRC asks the Board to condition NGFP approval and operationalization on four specific deliverables: (i) a complete operational framework with clear eligibility, governance, accountability and implementation milestones; (ii) a differentiated fee schedule for LDC, transition, fragile and COE portfolios; (iii) a costed, time-bound pre-financing facility with flexible payment schedules and phased participation options, before full operationalization; (iv) and a supply-constrained product access and regulatory-support protocol ensuring that self-financing buyers are not structurally disadvantaged. Procurement constraints should be addressed on both the supply side — availability, allocation, registration, import and last-mile delivery — and the demand side — fiscal space, foreign exchange, pre-financing and fee affordability.

Japan/Republic of Korea

- We highly commend the Global Fund for maintaining strong implementation capability despite limited resources and an unstable external environment. We also recognize that continuation of large-scale procurement, introduction of innovative medicines, advancement in malaria responses, strengthening regional manufacturing capacity, and enhancing supply chain efficiency is a significant achievement.
- We support the proposed decision to expand Non-Global Fund Financed Procurement (NGFP) as a strategic mechanism and to establish a dedicated financial management

framework. This is a valid direction for further strengthening procurement and market-shaping functions.

- In particular, we believe NGFP is not merely a procurement tool but a critical element that can determine the success of transition. Even after countries transitioned from the Global Fund grant, maintaining access to the latest innovations at affordable price with assured quality is indispensable for program continuity. Moreover, NGFP can act as an important incentive for countries to mobilize domestic resources and strengthen their procurement capabilities. We appreciate the design, which is not about complete cessation of support but maintaining support for market access under certain conditions, as promoting a more realistic and sustainable transition.

Communities

The Communities Delegation welcomes the proposed NGFP Policy and financial mechanism as a reasonable way to keep quality-assured products affordable and accessible as countries move away from Global Fund financing. We support the firm rule that no Quality Assurance Policy can be waived for any NGFP transaction, no matter who is buying or paying. Our main concern within this framework is equity of access. Countries with the lowest incomes and highest disease burden face the greatest barriers to using NGFP: upfront payment, limited access to foreign currency, and legal hurdles. We ask that pre-financing eligibility not favor countries simply because they have stronger financial systems. We also ask that future reporting breaks down NGFP uptake by income level and disease burden, rather than just showing total volume, and that the Secretariat clearly explain and share with the Strategy Committee how it decides to prioritize grant-funded procurement over NGFP when supply is limited.

This same equity concern extends to the legal and regulatory barriers countries face. When the Secretariat works with countries to fix procurement laws that create barriers, that engagement should include CCMs and community representatives, not just governments and development banks.

West and Central Africa

ESA and WCA support the evolution of the NextGen Market Shaping approach and the proposed decision point on the Policy for Non-Global Fund-financed Procurement. We welcome the revised strategy, particularly its focus on differentiated market shaping, expanded access beyond Global Fund financing and stronger regional manufacturing. We also commend the Secretariat's progress in accelerating the transition to dual active ingredient bed nets, introducing Lenacapavir for PrEP and diversifying malaria treatment options. Access to quality-assured, competitively priced health products should not be contingent on Global Fund grant financing.

As highlighted by ESA and WCA during the Strategy and Audit and Finance Committees discussions, it is essential that the expanded procurement model provides sufficient facility in procurement arrangement, in recognition of countries' differing levels of procurement system maturity. Countries with stronger systems should be supported to procure directly using national procurement platforms, while continuing to benefit from the Global Fund's market-shaping role. Indeed, many obtained lower prices than those on the wambo.org as several OIG reports have illustrated. Countries progressing towards greater sustainability should be able to access Global Fund-negotiated prices while strengthening their own procurement systems, while those requiring the full PPM/wambo.org service should continue to receive it. *How will the Secretariat ensure that this differentiated approach actively supports countries to progress towards greater procurement self-reliance while strengthening regional manufacturing and long-term health product security in Africa? Also, it is vital that both the Fund procured and non-GF procurement mechanisms buy more from Africa manufacturers. Many meet the Global Fund criteria and deliver quality-assured products and the low proportion of purchase from them is dismaying.*

11.1 Annual Procurement and Next Gen Reporting

World Health Organization

WHO welcomes the annual report and expresses appreciation for longstanding collaboration, including across three cycles of the Next Generation Market Shaping Strategic Initiative (2019–2020, 2021–2023, 2023–2026). These collaborations have included strengthening of relevant norms, standards, and quality assurance of medical products for Global Fund procurement, essential for implementing the Global Fund Strategy 2023–2028 and the GC8 strategic shifts.

WHO underscores the scale and importance of Global Fund procurement, noting that in 2025, US\$1.2 billion in grant-funded health products were ordered by principal recipients through the pooled procurement mechanism – 70% through long-term supplier agreements and 30% through other procurement service agents/partners, in line with the policy. This reinforces the need for strong market-shaping approaches grounded in quality, safety, and regulatory robustness. WHO welcomes the Global Fund's participation in the first Global Forum for Public Procurement (November 2025) and continued focus on collaborative procurement.

WHO welcomes the Global Fund's focus on maximizing impact through the continued NextGen Market Shaping Strategic Initiative, and focus on core enablers for the health products eco-system including adherence to WHO/international quality and safety standards; regional regulatory strengthening, harmonization and regulatory reliance; country readiness for update of new products; and procurement collaboration. WHO is supporting building of regional manufacturing ecosystems through skills development, Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) standards, regulatory readiness, ecosystem intelligence, technology transfer (including mRNA Technology Transfer Phase 2.0), operationalizing the Health Technology Access Programme (HTAP, an end-to-end platform to identify, license, transfer and scale priority technologies), and promotion of platforms such as the World Local Production Forum. This directly supports NextGen pillars on regional manufacturing capacity, innovation at scale, resilient supply chains, and regulatory strengthening.

WHO supports Global Fund's proposed focus on 'greater efficiency and effectiveness across market shaping activities, and deeper complementarity and joint efforts with partners' as key to advancing NextGen Market Shaping efforts into a new cycle. This speaks to the principles of the Lusaka Agenda and evolving global health eco-system focus on coordination, synergies and alignment to national priorities, and to adherence to WHO norms and standards (as approved by the relevant WHO Expert Committees) and work to strengthen regulatory systems through harmonization and reliance. The WHO Coalition of Interested Parties provides a platform to aid coordination of regulatory interventions in countries. The new NextGen iteration could also draw on WHO's extensive network and established mechanism to advance focus on collaborative procurement with Africa CDC and regional economic communities.

WHO emphasizes the importance of incorporating lessons from Strategic Initiatives including NextGen – for example to ensure i) alignment and adherence with WHO normative and standard-setting work and scheduled engagement with countries (e.g. ministries of health, national regulatory authorities, Central Medical Stores etc.) especially in

the areas of regulatory strengthening (including post-market surveillance) and supply and procurement; ii) demand generation and forecasting to ensure realistic and impactful interventions in countries; and iii) strengthened performance accountability, including analysis of availability gaps and results-based management.

WHO looks forward to continued collaboration, including to support transitions to efficient and effective country-led procurement systems as donor-funded procurement declines (see also Non-Global Fund-Financed Procurement below), underpinned by WHO procurement and quality assurance norms and standards across the product lifecycles such as the WHO Guideline on Good Procurement Practices and Model Quality Assurance System for Procurement Agencies (MQAS), and guidance on the safe disposal of pharmaceuticals. Through the Global Forum on Public Procurement of Health Products and targeted engagements, WHO is strengthening country uptake and capacity for quality-assured procurement. In keeping with the GC8 guidance to prioritize climate-resilient supply chain plans, WHO would welcome collaboration to implement the WHO 'Greener Pharmaceuticals' Regulatory Highway' call for action. Transition pathways should ensure complementarity with regional and national procurement platforms and alignment with WHO guidance and standards.

Developed Country NGO

We greatly appreciate the rapid work by the Secretariat – and the update to the Strategy Committee and the Board – on the Global Fund's response to the threats to supply chain and health product access caused by the war in Iran and the devastating toll impacting the surrounding region.

We are pleased to see more distinction between the upstream role of other actors, such as Unitaidd on innovation, and the downstream lead role of the GF.

Given the major disruptions to last mile delivery and supply chain worldwide right now, we hope to see the Global Fund continue to advance the kind of targeted support to last mile delivery laid out in the document, but recognize that this **does not** solve the crisis facing many countries due to system disruptions, **nor** do we see the Global Fund as the right body to take on that work.

Our Delegation does not oppose the expanded role given the discussions, however, we would like the Executive Director to clearly address why this expansion is more critical than other investments at this time. Why is this the trade-off (i.e., investment of scarce OPEX funds) that is worth investing in versus, for example, maintaining CCM budgets in the ALM, investing further resources in sub-optimally funded and Board approved Catalytic Investments, among other investment areas?

Western Pacific Region

WPC is pleased to see that the report demonstrates strong operational performance and strategic progress. However, the success of GC8 will depend not on procurement efficiency and other achievement at the Global Fund level but also on how effectively the Global Fund helps countries transition to sustainable, domestically led procurement and health systems while preserving the market-shaping gains achieved over the past decade. Hence, we put forward the following recommendations:

- Prioritize country transition readiness alongside product access. Ensure the introduction of new innovations is accompanied by sustainable financing, procurement capacity, regulatory preparedness, and supply chain strengthening, supported by clear transition roadmaps from the outset.
- Strengthen financing strategies for health innovations. Build on the Lenacapavir experience by establishing a structured financing framework, securing co-investment partners early, and defining sustainability and exit plans before large-scale introduction.
- Make supply chain resilience a core performance measure. Complement existing indicators with metrics on resilience, warehousing performance, stock visibility, emergency

preparedness, and climate- and conflict-related risks.

- Accelerate regional procurement alongside regional manufacturing. Expand partnerships with Africa CDC and regional blocs, promote demand aggregation, and pilot regional procurement mechanisms to achieve near-term efficiencies while manufacturing capacity matures.
- Strengthen community and civil society engagement. Increase community involvement in demand forecasting, stock-out monitoring, innovation uptake, and service accountability to support country ownership and sustainability.
- Scale up non-Global Fund-financed procurement. Set clearer growth targets, expand regional pilots, monitor transition-country participation, and proactively support countries ready to use non-grant-financed procurement mechanisms.
- Invest further in AI and digitalization. Expand the use of predictive analytics, demand forecasting, stock-out prediction, supplier risk monitoring, and automated procurement planning to sustain performance in a resource-constrained environment.

South East Asia

The SEA Constituency acknowledges this annual update and commends the Secretariat for continued progress in delivering value for money through the Pooled Procurement Mechanism, including the milestone introduction of lenacapavir PrEP — a breakthrough for HIV prevention in a region where progress among key populations remains critically slow.

We note that the 2025 procurement volume decline reflects expected grant cycle patterns rather than reduced programmatic need. Given SEA's disproportionate disease burden — over 45% of global TB cases and more than 4 million malaria cases annually — sustained procurement efficiency and supply security remain non-negotiable priorities for our region.

As GC8 NextGen Market Shaping shifts toward greater country ownership and transition support, we encourage the Secretariat to integrate supply chain strengthening into country engagement processes, particularly addressing cross-border supply vulnerabilities and absorptive capacity constraints that are pronounced across SEA.

We look forward to the Secretariat's engagement with SEA countries on non-Global Fund-financed procurement pathways as a practical tool for co-financing and transition strategies.

SEA constituency takes note of this report and supports the direction of travel for GC8 market shaping.

UNAIDS

The UNAIDS Constituency welcomes the continued evolution of the Global Fund's NextGen Market Shaping approach and the first Annual Procurement and NextGen Market Shaping Report. We appreciate the Secretariat's efforts to strengthen equitable access to quality-assured, affordable and innovative health products while supporting sustainability, country ownership and resilient health systems.

As countries prepare for Grant Cycle 8 in an increasingly constrained financing environment, strategic market shaping will play an increasingly important role in helping countries maximize the impact of limited resources. Beyond improving procurement efficiency, market shaping should strengthen equitable access to medicines, diagnostics and innovations, enhance supply security and support countries to sustain progress towards ending AIDS as a public health threat.

The UNAIDS Constituency particularly welcomes the continued emphasis on innovation, including expanding equitable access to new HIV prevention and treatment technologies, while recognising that innovation must be accompanied by affordability, sustainable financing and country readiness to ensure equitable uptake.

As implementation moves forward, we encourage continued focus on:

- ensuring rapid, affordable and equitable access to quality-assured HIV medicines, diagnostics and prevention technologies, including new prevention innovations;
- strengthening supply chain resilience and market security through diversified manufacturing, regional collaboration and strategic procurement;
- using data, country priorities and equity considerations to guide market shaping investments and procurement decisions;
- supporting country ownership by strengthening national procurement capacity and long-term market sustainability; and
- reinforcing collaboration across partners to maximise the collective impact of market shaping efforts and accelerate equitable access to innovation.

Ultimately, the success of market shaping should be measured not only by procurement efficiencies and cost savings, but by its contribution to stronger country ownership, equitable access, resilient supply systems and improved health outcomes for people living with and affected by HIV.

Point Seven

Point Seven welcomes the achievements in procurement and NextGen Market Shaping. Among others, we commend the Secretariat for the increase in procurement from Africa-based manufacturers and the growing use of non-Global Fund resources to procure through Wambo. While still modest in scale, these developments are encouraging, and we look forward to further progress. It would be appreciated if the Secretariat could provide periodic updates on progress in this regard.

In the 40 countries scheduled to transition at the end of GC8 and GC9, procurement will need to become fully country-led in the coming years. Ensuring that procurement currently financed through Global Fund resources is fully integrated into national plans and budgets will be a critical step towards full country ownership.

We also thank the Communities Delegation for its insightful paper on supply chain management performance and governance. We would welcome the Secretariat's reflections on the issues raised and opportunities to address them.

11.2 Policy on NGFP and establishment of NGFPM

Latin America and Caribbean

Policy on NGFP and establishment of NGFPM -GF/B55/05

The LAC Constituency supports the new Policy on Non Global Fund Financed Procurement, and the extension of its provisions to established Regional and National Procurement Mechanisms, several of which have already benefitted of a successful partnership with GF PPM.

LAC has long advocated for pre-financing solutions be available through **PPM/wambo.org**, recognizing the challenge of upfront payment requirements. Consequently, LAC supports the Global Fund's proposal to create a dedicated financial management framework. This ring-fenced mechanism—including a specific fee structure and pre-financing facility—will improve access and scale while maintaining financial integrity. Furthermore, the **NGFP Policy** provides an additional procurement route to secure low-cost, quality-assured health products and streamline access to innovation.

With regards to the principles based NGFP Framework, LAC welcomes the inclusion of regional and national pooled procurement mechanisms and their buyers. Additionally, we

support the standardized approach that enables procurement from manufacturers closer to the point of demand. By promoting regional sourcing, similar measures will effectively prevent the types of stock-outs experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Given the relevance of the matter for Countries in the Region, we would like to provide an overview

Update on Procurement and Pre-financing in LAC

- PAHO/WHO Strategic Fund

For several decades The Americas have extensively benefitted from pooled procurement of vaccines through a dedicated Revolving fund, and more recently, of HIV products, followed by other of high cost health commodities through the PAHO/WHO Strategic Fund (SF). The PAHO SF currently supports Member States across the Region of the Americas in the procurement and supply and management of medicines, diagnostic and monitoring devices, medical and laboratory equipment, and vector control supplies for communicable diseases. PAHO's Strategic Fund contributes to smooth implementation of Global Fund grants by reducing procurement cycle time and transaction costs while ensuring quality-assured products and transparent processes. Established mechanisms include access to credit lines, technical assistance, in strong cooperation with local regulatory and customs authorities. As part of an end-to-end strategy, PAHO QuantMet Platform assists countries in accurately estimating their needs for essential medicines and health technologies.

- PAHO/WHO Strategic Fund (SF) catalogue on essential medicines and health products for HIV, TB and Malaria

The PAHO SF catalogue was updated last year to include new antiretroviral treatment regimens, pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) regimens, medicines and diagnostic kits for advanced HIV disease, rapid diagnostic tests for HIV and hepatitis B and C, medicines for opportunistic infections, and new paediatric formulations of antiretroviral medicines.

In relation to tuberculosis (TB), the catalogue now includes new skin tests for diagnosis, artificial intelligence (AI)-enabled X-ray equipment, and new molecular diagnostic platforms recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO).

In the case of malaria, the Strategic Fund has added new treatment options, including tafenoquine, as well as equipment and reagents for G6PD deficiency testing, WHO-prequalified diagnostic tests, and vector control supplies.

In addition, the Strategic Fund has included a laboratory equipment and supplies for antimicrobial resistance (AMR) surveillance, helping strengthen the capacity of public health laboratories throughout the Region.

1.2 LAC countries using Strategic Fund and transitioning out of GF Financing

Most Latin American and Caribbean (LAC) countries are on track to transition out of direct Global Fund (GF) support by 2030. This accelerated timeline introduces major strategic shifts over the next two grant cycles. In Grant Cycle 8 (GC8), eight countries will transition away from country allocations across 12 distinct health components. This includes Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, and Paraguay for HIV; El Salvador and Peru for HIV/TB; and Honduras for HIV/TB/Malaria. Additionally, the Multi-Country Caribbean allocation (covering Suriname, Belize, Jamaica, and the OECS) will transition its HIV component. Looking ahead to Grant Cycle 9 (GC9), two more countries—Bolivia (HIV/TB/Malaria) and Cuba (HIV)—will transition their remaining four components.

In light of these imminent financing withdrawals, analysing regional procurement capacity is vital. During the most recent biennium, 25 countries and territories in the Region utilised the Strategic Fund to procure medicines, diagnostics, laboratory equipment, and vector control products. Notably, almost all of the transitioning nations—including Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and the Central American cohort—are already active SF users. Because of this established track record, the SF will likely become the preferred procurement mechanism to prevent supply disruptions as countries lose direct Global Fund financing.

- Regional negotiations Models as premier models for regional efficiency

- Executive Secretariat of the Council of Central America (Belize, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panamá) and Dominican Republic Ministries of Health (SE-COMISCA)

The SE-COMISCA operates a Joint Negotiation Mechanism which allows national health

systems of members' countries to purchase quality assured health products at prices significantly lower than those achieved through individual negotiation and procurement processes level. This mechanism has generated savings of over USD \$209 million since its inception in 2009.

Currently, all eight member states of this Central America Integration System (SICA) purchase through PAHO SF their ARVs, drugs for opportunistic infections, GeneXpert equipment and molecular diagnostics for TB, treatment options and rapid test diagnostic for malaria. It is worth mentioning how procurement modalities are centralized (Belize, El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, Panamá and Dominican Republic), decentralized (Guatemala) and hybrid/mixed Modality (Honduras). Deployment of AI assisted TB rapid diagnostics is currently under way in remote areas.

2.3 OECS Pooled Procurement Services

The Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) operates Pooled Procurement Services of pharmaceuticals and related medical supplies for Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, British Virgin Islands, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines. Countries are required to forecast their needs, and the Commission sources and procures. Pharmaceuticals, laboratory and essential health commodities, including small amounts as in the case of Paediatric ARVs.

- Wambo in LAC:

During the 2024–2025 period, the Global Fund's Pooled Procurement Mechanism (PPM) via wambo.org supported the coordinated supply of critical health products across the Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) region.

- Portfolio Breakdown

- Total Portfolio Value: Approximately US\$ 27.3 million.

- Product Mix: Centred heavily on pharmaceuticals (ARVs, essential medicines), rapid diagnostics (HIV, Hepatitis B/C, Syphilis, Malaria), laboratory supplies (viral load, chemistry, hematology, microscopy), and HIV prevention commodities (condoms and lubricants), with limited vector control items (ITNs and IRS).

- Geographic Distribution: Procurement was strategically concentrated in high-burden settings. Haiti alone accounted for nearly 60% of the total portfolio value. The remaining funds comprised a diverse mix of smaller, targeted orders across Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Guyana.

3.2 Logistics & Operational Realities

Of the total portfolio value, US\$ 8 million was spent on international freight and insurance. Long shipping distances via air and sea combined with small regional order volumes created high per-unit transportation costs. Consequently, several countries reported operational barriers due to these steep freight expenses.

Despite these logistical constraints, the PPM platform provided foundational benefits to the region: cost efficiencies from pooled purchasing, strict quality assurance, predictable procurement lead times, and increased supply chain transparency.

Strategic Considerations for Board Discussion

As several LAC nations prepare for an imminent transition away from Global Fund financing, the LAC Constituency presents the following recommendations regarding the Next Generation Market Shaping Policy (NGFMP):

1. Enable Early Complementarity to Prevent Duplication

Instead of building isolated transition pathways, the Global Fund must focus on how wambo.org can proactively integrate with existing national and regional mechanisms.

- Leverage the PAHO Strategic Fund (SF): The PAHO SF already possesses features equivalent to the proposed NGFPM framework, including revolving funds and pre-financing

facilities.

- The Goal: A formalised collaboration between Wambo and the PAHO SF to optimize value-for-money, utilize regional technical support, and completely avoid infrastructural duplication.

2. Accelerate Access to Diagnostic and Treatment Innovations

The LAC Constituency notes potential implementation delays regarding the NGFPM policy. Given these delays, the Global Fund must strategically evaluate how remaining resources can be optimized to grant transitioning countries rapid access to the latest HIV, TB, and malaria innovations.

3. Ensure Equitable Regional Access to Lenacapavir

The initial public pilot programme for the breakthrough HIV prevention drug, Lenacapavir, restricts LAC participation to just three Global Fund-supported countries: the Dominican Republic, Honduras, and Haiti.

- The Request: The Board must actively explore broader regional opportunities and negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the current PPM structure. This is vital to ensure equitable access to Lenacapavir across a region dominated by transitioning states.

4. Clarify Administrative Demand and Financial Scope

Developing a highly detailed procurement infrastructure places an immense burden on countries facing severely restricted fiscal spaces and limited human resources.

- The Request: The LAC Constituency requests detailed projections and clarifications regarding the expected magnitude, scope, and operational workload demand that this policy's implementation will require in the coming years.

World Health Organization

WHO recognizes that the proposed Policy on Non-Global Fund-Financed Procurement through the Pooled Procurement Mechanism (PPM) / wambo.org is an important emerging strategic pillar and emphasises key principles and opportunities for the policy and its implementation: guidance of procurement decisions by public health needs, country priorities, transparency, fair competition, and objective assessments of quality and value; prioritization of quality-assured medicines in NGFP and its stewardship, especially if/as new pooled procurement mechanisms develop; safeguarding of continued access, supply and service continuity, and equity, including for key and vulnerable populations; situating of NGFP within overall sustainability and transition pathways, including to ensure continued access to quality-assured medicines and health products as countries transition from Global Fund support, while recognizing the associated need and wider implications for sustainable domestic health financing.

WHO welcomes the Global Fund's intent to collaborate with other pooled procurement mechanisms, while encouraging careful consideration of proposals to expand non-grant-financed procurement mechanisms. Such expanded arrangements represent a significant evolution beyond the Global Fund's traditional grant-financed mandate and raise important questions regarding governance, comparative advantage, fiduciary risk, and long-term sustainability. Any new financing modalities, including pre-financing or credit-based approaches, should be designed to complement the roles of multilateral development banks and other institutions with established mandates and expertise in sovereign financing and systems development. If tied to domestic co-financing commitments, risks should be carefully assessed based on fiscal feasibility of those commitments.

WHO acknowledges the governance, accountability framework, and financial discipline principles reflected in the proposed NGFP Policy, and would appreciate further clarification on how non-grant financing would be managed within the proposed platform. For funding from bilateral partners additional information is needed on the applicable governance arrangements, procurement requirements, segregation of funding where necessary while avoiding fragmentation across financing streams, and the implications for Board oversight, fiduciary accountability, and alignment with country priorities. Additional information is also needed on how the platform would manage domestically financed

procurement, including governance arrangements, integration with national public financial management, and procurement systems. Operationally, it will be important to ensure adequate capacity to lead and sustain WAMBO.

Implementation of the policy will require active monitoring and management to preserve market stability and continuity of supply. Procurement efficiency depends on the performance of the entire procurement and supply chain, including market intelligence, demand forecasting, financing arrangements, pricing transparency, quality assurance, and integration with national distribution systems. Further information would be valuable on how the proposed platform would address these dimensions, maintain its role as a neutral market-shaping system, manage fiduciary risks, and demonstrate value for money as procurement expands beyond its traditional grant-financed scope. Sustainable market outcomes will depend on predictable, transparent, and well-coordinated implementation, including transparent, impartial, and non-discriminatory processes that safeguard competition, support healthy supplier participation, and ensure equitable access to quality-assured health products.

WHO encourages a continued focus on translating the policy into sustainable, system-wide impact—including through flexibility in transition trajectories, and ensuring complementarity with regional and national procurement platforms and with efforts to strengthen regional and local manufacturing capacity. WHO encourages development of a clearer overall transition theory of change. As part of this, a step-wise “ladder” for successful transition outcomes related to procurement might include: i) how countries move from grant financed to domestically financed procurement, and from Global Fund led to national and regional procurement models; ii) how market shaping interventions contribute to sustainability outcomes over time; iii) how supply continuity, availability and equitable access to quality-assured essential life-saving commodities are preserved during transitions and sustained thereafter.

Western Pacific Region

The Western Pacific Constituency strongly supports this policy and considers it a transformative step forward. On the one hand, it builds on the Global Fund’s market-shaping power to improve access to quality-assured health products. On the other hand, it provides greater assurance to countries—including those in transition—and to affected communities by strengthening the long-term security and continuity of access to essential health products. Looking ahead, the WPC encourages the Global Fund to strengthen collaboration with other pooled procurement mechanisms, such as those managed by UNDP, UNICEF, and the Global Drug Facility (GDF), to further consolidate market-shaping power, enhance supply resilience, and improve the availability and affordability of HTM commodities.

We have the following questions that we would appreciate the response from the Secretariat:

- How will innovative products be allocated fairly when demand exceeds supply, particularly for countries that are no longer Global Fund grant recipients but still face significant disease burdens?
- Will Country Teams proactively support governments in integrating PPM/wambo.org into sustainability and transition planning, rather than relying on countries to request access?
- How will the Secretariat ensure that small island countries can practically access the new mechanism, given their limited procurement capacity, lower-capacity health systems while facing higher perceived financial risk?

South East Asia

The SEA Constituency welcomes the proposed Policy on Non-Global Fund-Financed Procurement and the establishment of the NGFP Mechanism as a timely and strategically important step for our region.

SEA carries a disproportionate share of the global disease burden, over 45% of TB cases, 4 million malaria cases annually, and 3.9 million people living with HIV. As domestic financing

responsibilities grow and Global Fund allocations evolve, countries in our region urgently need reliable and affordable alternatives for quality-assured health product procurement. NGFP through WAMBO directly responds to this reality.

We support the proposed Policy and financial framework, particularly the pre-financing facility, which addresses a critical barrier for countries facing financial regulatory constraints on advance payments.

The SEA Constituency emphasizes that fee structures must be transparent, equitable, and sensitive to country income levels, with concessional provisions for LICs and LMICs subject to annual AFC approval. Pre-financing eligibility should take into account liquidity and budget timing constraints, rather than being determined by creditworthiness alone.

We encourage the Secretariat to ensure that country engagement explicitly prioritizes SEA countries navigating complex national procurement legislation, and that technical assistance is made available to systematically address the related challenges.

Finally, we highlight that the 24-month integrated review must include disaggregated regional data, enabling the Board to assess whether the mechanism is delivering equitably across constituencies.

SEA supports approval of this decision point.

UNAIDS

The UNAIDS Constituency welcomes the proposed Policy on Non-Grant Funded Procurement as an important tool for transitioning and transitioned countries.

Enabling countries to access Global Fund procurement mechanisms using domestic or other financing can help preserve affordability, quality assurance and supply security as countries diversify financing sources. To ensure NGFPM addresses country-specific needs and barriers to uptake, its development and rollout must be grounded on close consultation with current and prospective users, and learn from other procurement mechanisms.

Expanding access to Global Fund procurement mechanisms must be accompanied by continued technical support to countries for forecasting, procurement planning, market management and supply chain strengthening.

Implementation of the policy should continue to ensure:

- access to pre-financing and supply-constrained innovations for countries is grounded in principles of equity, public health impact, and financing contexts;
 - continued affordability of essential HIV commodities and emerging innovations;
 - maintenance of robust quality assurance standards;
 - robust cost and performance metrics, benchmarks and accountability mechanisms;
 - strong country ownership supported by sustainable national procurement and supply chain capacity; and
 - alignment with broader efforts to strengthen resilient health systems and sustainable HIV responses.
- Safeguards to ensure that rapid scale-up of NGFPM protects core capacity and resources for grant implementation.

The UNAIDS Constituency looks forward to continued collaboration with the Global Fund Secretariat and partners to ensure that procurement reforms contribute to improved health outcomes, equitable access to lifesaving HIV commodities and stronger nationally led and owned systems and capacities.

Point Seven

The Policy on Non-Global Fund Financed Procurement through the PPM is welcomed, alongside the growing use of non-Global Fund resources through Wambo. The expected increase in uptake of this mechanism is encouraging. The role of the Strategy Committee and Audit and Finance Committee in reviewing and advising on the Policy and its operationalization is recognized. At the same time, the Board should retain its ultimate oversight role and decision-making authority on strategic policy matters. It is important that the division of responsibilities between the Board and its Committees is clearly reflected in the Policy.

The flexibility to accommodate buyer preferences with appropriate safeguards is also welcomed, while stressing the importance of ensuring that external partner preferences, including requests to source from specific manufacturers or regions, do not undermine value-for-money principles. Clear criteria should guide such decisions, and any considerations to deviate from these principles should be transparently presented to the Board for review.

European Commission, Belgium, Italy, Portugal, Spain

European Constituencies welcome the policy change enabling non-Global Fund procurement through the Global Fund's procurement platform. We see clear potential for this mechanism to expand affordable access to quality-assured health products and to strengthen the Global Fund's value proposition to partners. At the same time, we require robust transparency safeguards.

- Checks and balances: clear-cut guardrails and an operationalization of admissible “limited deviations” from GFATM procurement policy are missing. We therefore propose an amendment for the DP requesting that the Secretariat returns to the SC at its October 2026 meeting with a further articulation of the safeguards to achieve value for money, protect against market distortion and supplier concentration, and support effective oversight and reporting on implementation and associated risks.
- Pre-Financing facility: ensuring that the operational framework sets clear parameters for prioritisation, focusing on countries most in need.
- Supplier and manufacturing geography outcomes: transparency on how non-Global Fund procurement affects supplier base diversification and manufacturing geography, including implications for regional manufacturing ambitions.
- A long-term strategic perspective for the platform should be linked with the broader ongoing architecture reform discussions, ensuring that it supports and complements regional and country-level procurement platforms as these evolve. We ask the Secretariat to work towards clear interoperability benchmarks with regional and country-level procurement platforms.
- African manufacturing: we strongly ask that the platform's growth be accompanied by a clear ambition to progressively increase the share of African manufacturers in the overall volume of transactions, in line with the Global Fund's broader commitment to supporting regional manufacturing capacity and supply diversification. We ask the Secretariat to work towards a clear time-bound trajectory and to further reflect on a potential regional manufacturing target.

12. Closed session

South East Asia

N/A

UNAIDS
NA

13. Coffee

South East Asia
N/A

UNAIDS
NA

14. Executive Director Nomination Committee Progress Update

Developed Country NGO

We eagerly anticipate these periodic updates and highlight that “EDNC members noted comfort with the quality of the shortlist, while expressing a desire to further enhance regional balance/diversity” (p. 2). The report indicates that the EDNC agreed to adapt its work plan to enable Russell Reynolds to conduct a limited phase of additional targeted outreach. The Developed Country NGO Board Delegation supports the limited phase of additional targeted outreach in order to further enhance regional balance / diversity.

Our Delegation would like to know if the additional targeted outreach resulted in additional candidates and, if so, if the EDNC has shortlisted any of the additional candidates. Beyond the 30th June communications to the Board on the confidentiality of the selection process and standard media guidance, what other response(s) or mitigating measures have the EDNC and EGC leadership explored and enacted?

West and Central Africa

WCA and ESA take note of the progress made by the Executive Director Nomination Committee and the continued implementation of a confidential, merit-based and non-political selection process, including efforts to broaden the candidate pool while maintaining consistent competency and due diligence standards. As the Board moves towards appointing the next Executive Director, the constituencies will look for a leader with the strategic vision to guide the Global Fund through an evolving global health and financing landscape while maintaining focus on its core mission and strengthening country ownership

South East Asia

The most consequential decision in this update is not the shortlist itself. It is the EDNC’s decision to supplement the original candidate pool through a limited phase of targeted outreach after the first shortlisting exercise, while maintaining a single, uniform selection process before Round 1 interviews in July.

Every implementing constituency will answer to whoever is appointed, and confidence in that appointment rests on knowing the process treated every candidate identically, not simply on trusting that it did. Therefore, we ask two things.

First, that the EDNC confirm to the Board, ahead of the 1-2 October Board Retreat, that every candidate, regardless of when they entered the process, completed the same Phase 1 and Phase 2 due diligence and was assessed against the same Board-approved competency requirements, and that no element of due diligence or assessment was modified as a result of the adapted timetable.

Second, the Final EDNC Report in September explicitly states whether the targeted outreach achieved its stated objective of improving regional and gender diversity, without requiring disclosure of individual candidates or their timelines.

UNAIDS
NA

Point Seven

Point Seven would like to thank the EDNC for the update and welcome the continued process in the selection process.

We emphasize the importance of a robust, transparent and timely process to ensure a successful outcome and stress that the additional targeted outreach cannot be allowed to cause further delays.

Point Seven emphasises the need to ensure that the coming Executive Director is put in position early 2027 to assure that the Global Fund is led by an Executive Director that has a strong mandate, clear strategic vision, and the leadership skills required to guide the Global Fund through an increasingly complex and evolving global health landscape during the years to come.

15. Governance Effectiveness

Latin America and Caribbean

LAC Constituency Position: Governance and Oversight Measures

In response to the critical question of how to maintain agile, focused, and effective governance in a more constrained operating environment—while protecting the distinctive values of the Global Fund partnership—the LAC Constituency offers the following reflections on the proposed near-term measures:

1. Strategic Agendas, Work Plans, and Intersessional Engagement

LAC strongly recommends deliberately leveraging intersessional virtual engagement to handle preliminary updates, thereby reserving live meeting time exclusively for high-level strategic discussions, as well as prioritizing decision-oriented sessions while saving time from for information matters. As demonstrated during the COVID-19 pandemic, proactive intersessional engagement is a proven mechanism for accelerating effective decision-making at the Board level.

2. Streamlined Reporting

LAC concurs with the need to review reporting frequency and information-sharing requirements. Transitioning to a lighter reporting format focused strictly on high-impact and high-risk issues will reduce the administrative burden on both authors and readers. Furthermore, LAC recalls that the Global Fund Secretariat (GFS) previously prepared recorded PowerPoint presentations to brief members on critical issues ahead of Board meetings. We highly recommend that the GFS reinstate these advance video updates to

facilitate better preparation.

3. Enabling Productive Dialogue

Board deliberations have improved significantly in recent years as members have shifted toward active, real-time debates rather than reading repetitive, pre-written statements. LAC supports continuing the practice of submitting written constituency statements in advance, allowing live meeting time to be used dynamically to build on those inputs, draw on dialogue and interaction dynamics; and provide clearer strategic direction.

4. Reducing Duplication and Clarifying Roles

LAC supports clearly defining which issues should be resolved at the committee level versus which must escalate to the Board, ensuring committees complement rather than repeat Board deliberations. To maintain transparency, LAC considers it vital to preserve the right of Constituencies to participate as observers in committees where they lack formal representation, allowing them to follow the debate closely.

5. Clarifying Governance Processes & Agile Calendars

LAC supports clarifying governance processes to reduce redundant discussions, eliminate diluted accountability and avoid unnecessary administrative strain. We also endorse an agile governance calendar that strategically utilises virtual sessions to maintain momentum on time-sensitive issues.

6. Delegation Arrangements for Board Meetings

LAC agrees with exploring hybrid delegation modalities that balance essential in-person participation with remote access (e.g., smaller in-person delegations supported by virtual access for additional delegates and observers).

However, we emphasise the need to maintain flexibility regarding in-person delegation sizes—which must remain equal for all Constituencies—based on the specific agenda items of each meeting:

- **High-Stake Meetings:** At least one Board meeting per calendar year should accommodate a larger in-person delegation size to facilitate real-time collaboration and involvement in critical, complex discussions.
- **Routine or Closed Meetings:** Conversely, meetings focused heavily on closed executive sessions or the formal approval of decision points already finalised during intersessional engagement can operate efficiently with a downsized in-person footprint.

World Health Organization

WHO takes note of the emphasis on governance effectiveness in a constrained environment and **underscores the importance of ensuring that reforms enable timely, transparent and evidence informed decision making in support of country impact.**

In line with its normative and technical mandate to support countries in delivering essential health services, WHO notes that increased prioritization and resource constraints may require difficult choices regarding the scope of support provided to countries by the Global Fund. In this context, it will be important to **ensure that such decisions are guided by equity, country needs, and health impact considerations**, while ensuring that the perspectives and experiences of implementing countries remain appropriately reflected in the decision making process.

For example, WHO welcomes the increasing collaboration and exchanges with the Global Fund secretariat to address the increasing global and regional risks to malaria progress, including through alignment of grant disbursements with WHO guidance on prioritization of

interventions.

As governance arrangements evolve, WHO encourages to also **maintain strong avenues for technical expertise, alongside transparency and inclusive access to information.**

Complementarity across partners, and alignment around country priorities, will maximize collective impact and ensure coherent support to countries.

Eastern Mediterranean Region

The EMRC welcomes a governance model that remains proportionate, focused, and an enabler of impact in a resource-constrained environment. We support disciplined agendas, the reduction of duplication, and the deliberate use of intersessional and virtual engagement where these advance — rather than displace — meaningful deliberation.

We note, however, the paper's own caution: streamlining carries the risk of diluting implementer voice and creating information inequity across constituencies of differing capacity. For a multi-country constituency operating substantially in conflict-affected and constrained operating environments, these are not abstract risks. The proposal to reduce delegation size — on which the EGC itself recorded mixed feedback, expressly flagging multi-country constituencies — is a direct trade-off between cost and voice. Committee deliberation and intersessional engagement can support but cannot replace productive and meaningful participation by implementer constituencies at Board meetings. Greater reliance on committee work, absent guaranteed standards for reporting back, compounds the asymmetry between high- and lower-capacity constituencies.

The EMRC's support for proportionality is therefore anchored to three conditions. First, any measure touching delegation size or Board composition should be preceded by an inclusion-impact assessment for implementer constituencies, particularly those representing countries in COE and fragile settings. Second, greater reliance on committee work should be paired with guaranteed reporting-back and escalation standards: timely written summaries shared with all constituencies; clear records of decisions, dissent and outstanding issues; early circulation of materials; constituency briefings; and escalation of unresolved matters before Board decisions. Third, the longer-term questions raised in the paper — including any reconsideration of the donor-implementer division — should proceed through a structured and transparent pathway, sequenced after the leadership transitions rather than concurrent with them.

Japan/Republic of Korea

- We consider mission focus to be the paramount principle for effective governance.

Governance is ultimately a tool to fulfill the Global Fund's mission, and its process should not become an end in themselves. At the same time, governance must remain adaptable rather than constrained by existing approaches, so that it can maximize its contribution and impact within the broader global health architecture. We also believe the most vital functions of governance are: (1) agility in decision-making and (2) ensuring consensus-building processes. The capability for appropriate and timely decision-making, which responds to the needs on the ground, is indispensable for governance. Simultaneously, inclusiveness in consensus-building processes should also be highly valued.

- The greatest strength of the Global Fund's governance model lies in its ability to reflect perspectives from diverse stakeholders. (1) agility in decision-making and (2) ensuring inclusivity are not always mutually exclusive, and it is necessary to strike an appropriate balance, considering the nature and content to the decisions to be made. We must be cautious that an exclusive pursuit of governance efficiency does not inadvertently lead to a disregard for, or exclusion of, diverse stakeholder voices from the decision-making process.

Developed Country NGO

We welcome the opportunities to further discuss governance effectiveness at the Board retreat and this Board meeting, particularly ways to address the issues raised in the letter sent to Board Leadership by the Communities, Developing Country NGO and Developed Country

NGO Delegations.

We look forward to working with the current and incoming Board Leadership during the transition and onboarding period to address these concerns and find workable solutions.

Communities

The Communities Delegation recognizes the realities the Global Fund faces in a complex, resource-constrained context, and that governance cannot be exempt from that discipline. The Global Fund's governance model and the Board's diversity and depth of engagement within it enable the impact this Board exists to steward. We wish to contribute to finding savings in ways that protect what is essential about that model, even if that means some things about how we currently work will need to change. We offer the following on the three measures most relevant to our constituency, in that spirit:

On Delegation Size and Meeting Format (Focus Area 7)

We agree that current delegation and meeting arrangements cannot continue unchanged, and we are willing to work within a smaller in-person footprint. We propose splitting meeting time by function: information-sharing and input decisions to be made online, ahead of sessions; in-person time should be reserved for decisions and substantive deliberation. We are open to fewer in-person days overall, or smaller core delegations supplemented by virtual participation for decision-adjacent discussion; we are open to that, provided the people present for actual decisions still reflect the diversity this model depends on to deliver impact.

On Reliance on Committee Work (Focus Area 4)

We accept that not every issue can or should return to the full Board, and we support giving committees more real authority to resolve matters within clear mandates, including on some issues we might currently expect to see at the Board level. Our ask is that the line be set deliberately, with clarity on which categories of decision, those with major cross-country or population implications for impact, should be reserved for full Board deliberation, especially during this period of significant change.

On Streamlined Reporting (Focus Area 2)

We fully support cutting volume and production time here, and accept that this may mean less material reaching us in less detail than we're accustomed to. What we ask in exchange is that whatever is shortened still meets a basic bar of adequacy for decision-making that protects impact, and in our experience, concise summary reports with tables and data visualizations meet that bar better than presentation-style formats, at equal or lower production cost. We're glad to accept lower volume; we simply want to make sure it doesn't mean less clarity.

We recognize that achieving real savings will require some discomfort from all constituencies, including ours. Governance effectiveness, in a resource-constrained context, must ultimately be measured against its purpose: enabling the Board to make decisions that deliver impact for the people the Global Fund serves. Our aim is simply to ensure that, as the Board absorbs these trade-offs, the depth of engagement and diversity of voice that make this governance model effective are protected.

West and Central Africa

Efficiency should extend to the whole institution, and not only to the governance.

The constituencies recognise the need to improve governance effectiveness in a more constrained financial environment. However, governance reform should be guided first and foremost by the Global Fund's core mission of saving lives. Decisions on efficiency and trade-offs should prioritise protecting country allocations, programme delivery and health impact. And these sets of results cannot be made without the diverse voices of implementers. ESA and WCA believe governance reform should extend across the institution, not focus disproportionately on governance processes or implementer participation. Efforts to improve efficiency should reduce duplication, bureaucracy and low-value processes across the Secretariat, assurance functions and country support arrangements. Wherever possible, savings should be redirected towards country programmes and strengthening country systems.

The Secretariat and its committees are power and influence centres. Efforts to

strengthen effectiveness must address not only constituency delegate head counts, but also process simplification and prioritizing inclusion.

ESA and WCA support practical measures to improve coordination, strengthen follow-up to Committee recommendations and accelerate decision-making while preserving transparency, accountability and meaningful consultation. We also encourage a review of the observer policy to allow constituency secretariat staff supporting Board delegations to observe Committee meetings virtually, strengthening continuity and institutional memory at minimal additional cost.

It is also important to note that other centres of power influence the Global Fund decision-making but are not officially 'governance'. In addition to the Secretariat, the Situation Rooms appear conspicuously closed to implementers who actually have the experience of what works and what will not. We strongly encourage discussions of effectiveness to include an assessment of the size of the Secretariat's County Teams and the high number of visits to counties per country per year.

Special care must be taken to avoid disproportionate burdens to implementer constituencies.

The Global Fund's governance model assigns detailed policy and technical deliberations to committees, with the Board itself focusing on strategic oversight and decision-making. While this division of labour is intended to improve efficiency, it may have unintended consequences for implementer constituencies.

Implementer constituencies are often represented at the Board by Ministers of Health or other senior political leaders, reflecting the importance of political ownership and accountability. At the committee level, however, representation is more commonly provided by technical experts who have the time and expertise to engage in detailed policy discussions over extended periods. This complementary arrangement enables constituencies to bring both political leadership and technical depth to the governance process.

Historically, sufficiently-sized delegations have helped bridge this divide by allowing technical advisers to support political leaders during Board meetings and ensuring continuity between committee and Board discussions.

As delegation sizes are reduced in the interest of efficiency, an important question arises: **does this disproportionately affect implementer constituencies?** Unlike some other constituencies, they may no longer be able to maintain the balance between political representation and technical engagement that effective participation requires.

This challenge is further compounded by the fact that constituencies cannot routinely observe committee meetings, resulting in fewer opportunities to follow discussions across the governance architecture, build institutional knowledge, and ensure coherence between committees and the Board. The African constituencies created a Bureau to support this. But this Secretariat does not exist in the GF governance structure, making information sharing and other support ad hoc and thus limiting the potential of the Bureau.

These considerations point to a broader governance principle: **equal governance rules do not necessarily result in equitable participation.** A governance model that applies identical arrangements to all constituencies may unintentionally disadvantage those with fundamentally different representation needs. Ensuring equitable participation may therefore require differentiated approaches that recognize the distinct realities of implementer and donor constituencies while preserving the effectiveness and legitimacy of the Board's governance. These observations raise several questions for consideration:

- Is the pursuit of efficiency inadvertently reducing the effectiveness of participation for implementer constituencies?
- Should delegation arrangements take into account the differing governance needs of implementer and donor constituencies rather than applying a uniform approach?
- Are there alternative mechanisms—such as enhanced observer access, greater cross-committee participation, or more flexible delegation arrangements—that could preserve efficiency while ensuring equitable participation across constituencies?

Western Pacific Region

The Western Pacific Region Constituency welcomes the paper on strengthening governance effectiveness and supports the aim of ensuring that Global Fund governance remains focused, agile, and impact-oriented in an increasingly complex and resource-constrained environment.

At the same time, we emphasize that reform must preserve inclusive representation, meaningful country and community voice, transparency, and accountability. We offer five recommendations:

1. Clarify challenges, baselines, and expected outcomes. We recommend clearly defining the governance challenges being addressed, the evidence behind them, and the baseline and measurable outcomes needed to assess whether reforms deliver tangible improvements.

2. Safeguard inclusive and representative governance.

Streamlining should preserve meaningful participation by implementer constituencies, communities, and countries. Safeguards are needed to ensure efficiency gains do not weaken voice, transparency, or accountability.

3. Reduce duplication while improving information equity.

We support simplifying reporting and governance materials, including identifying what can be stopped, consolidated, or merged. Digital reporting tools and concise regional digests should help ensure information equity, especially for small island states and constituencies with limited capacity.

4. Apply an equity lens to delegation and governance arrangements.

Any changes to delegation size, Board composition, or committee structures should be inclusive, transparent, and assessed for their differential impact on constituencies such as Western Pacific. Smaller physical delegations may help manage travel costs, but formal statement reading remains an important safeguard for diverse and geographically dispersed constituencies. Strong intersessional coordination and asynchronous feedback tools should accompany any changes.

5. Track progress and report regularly.

Reforms should include clear indicators, safeguards for transparency and inclusiveness, and regular reporting to the Board on progress, challenges, and lessons learned.

Lastly, we support governance reform that improves focus, agility, and proportionality while maintaining the balance between efficiency, accountability, timely decision-making, and meaningful representation.

South East Asia

Governance effectiveness in this paper comes down to one idea: matching process to capacity. But capacity is not the same across constituencies. Donor constituencies are often single countries with staff who can follow Global Fund business between Board meetings. The SEA Constituency represents multiple implementing countries, where Board meetings are often the main opportunity to follow decisions that directly affect programmes.

Measures such as shorter meetings, smaller delegations and lighter reporting may improve efficiency. But if applied in the same way to every constituency, they could have the greatest impact on those with the fewest alternatives for staying informed and coordinating between meetings. The paper recognises this trade-off, but it does not yet propose a way to assess it before making changes.

The Ethics and Governance Committee has already agreed to continue this discussion in October. We ask for one additional step: a written assessment, organised by constituency type rather than presented as a single overall view, that shows how each proposed measure affects multi-country implementing constituencies, including participation, access to information, and the quality of Board discussions. No permanent changes to delegation arrangements or meeting formats should be made until that assessment has been considered.

We also ask the Coordinating Group to report which agenda items moved to virtual or written-only formats, and whether those changes resulted in more Board time being spent on

strategic decisions.

If they did, without reducing implementer visibility into Board business, the changes should continue. If they did not, the Board should adjust the approach before making it permanent.

UNAIDS

The UNAIDS Constituency welcomes the opportunity to discuss governance effectiveness at a pivotal moment for the partnership. As recognized in the Annual Risk Management Report, governance effectiveness is itself an enterprise risk and will be increasingly important to ensuring that the Global Fund remains agile, strategic and fit for purpose in a rapidly evolving global health landscape.

We support continued efforts to strengthen governance by improving strategic focus, reducing unnecessary burden and ensuring that governance arrangements remain proportionate, responsive and capable of supporting timely, informed decision-making while preserving the principles that have made the Global Fund partnership successful.

As governance continues to evolve, it will be important to maintain an appropriate balance between effectiveness, accountability, transparency and inclusive stakeholder participation. Equally important is ensuring clarity of roles and responsibilities across the governance structure, recognising that effective governance depends not only on sound processes but also on each part of the partnership fulfilling its respective role.

The Global Fund's unique multi-stakeholder governance model remains one of its greatest strengths. We encourage continued attention to practical improvements that enable the Board, Committees and Secretariat to focus on strategic oversight, country impact and effective stewardship while maintaining trust, shared accountability and meaningful engagement by implementers, civil society, communities and technical partners.

Point Seven

Point Seven welcomes the review of the Global Fund's governance structures and supports efforts to ensure an effective and efficient governance system. We agree that effective governance requires striking appropriate balances across multiple dimensions e.g. balancing inclusivity with efficiency, transparency with deliberation, and representation with practical accessibility.

We would like to highlight some aspects of importance to us related to a few of the dimensions captured in the report, as well as one additional dimension:

- **Roles and Responsibilities:** There needs to be a clear delineation between the roles of the Secretariat, the Board, its committees, and collaborating partners to ensure accountability and operational efficiency.
- **Capacity and Proportionality:** Without the capacity to digest all information provided to the Board its steer becomes superficial and the Board loses its oversight function. It should be considered to make substantial changes in the amount and detail of the papers that the Board receives to ensure effective oversight.
- **Voice:** Ensuring relevant perspectives are heard and considered remains essential, particularly recognizing that trade-offs can create inequities between single-stakeholder and multi-stakeholder constituencies.
- **Trade-offs and Prioritization:** The Board must be made aware during decision making if their decisions mandate difficult trade-offs to ensure transparency of consequences.
- **Transparency:** Though not formally listed among core principles, transparency

fundamentally contributes to both legitimacy and trust.

Near-Term Practical Recommendations

We welcome the suggestion for a focused agenda and increased intersessional engagement. This should include Global Fund members more broadly—including those not currently serving on the Board. While Board Members and Alternates speak on behalf of constituencies, technical discussions and related matters should remain open to all interested constituency members. Past practice offered greater access in this regard. Opening these discussions could also reduce Board meeting agenda items by addressing non-decision matters in advance.

To maximize effectiveness in the near term we have the following considerations:

- Written Statements must be uploaded with sufficient time for others to read, ensuring their meaningful contribution to Board discussions rather than one-way communication from Board to Secretariat. To enable this, the Board must receive concise meeting papers in due time.
- Reducing repeated discussions is valuable, but must be paired with improved information flow from committees and better opportunities for non-members to provide input.
- The difference in impact of downsizing delegation size for Board meetings between single- and multi-stakeholder constituencies must be acknowledged and carefully considered.
- Governance hub access is currently restricted to constituency leadership. We advocate for opening it to all registered constituency members unless doing so creates significant expense for the Global Fund. Improved access would both facilitate increased transparency and increase effectiveness in constituency preparations.
- While recognizing the value of retreats, their extensive use warrants further discussion. No formal decisions occur during these sessions, yet important issues and perspectives are raised that later influence Board discussions—making full engagement difficult for absent members. Additionally, closed sessions place coordination burdens on constituency leadership before and after meetings, rendering the overall governance process more cumbersome.

Areas for Future Reflection

We welcome the three proposed future reflection areas and recommend initiating intelligence-gathering now so substantive discussions can begin when broader reform processes yield recommendations.

16. Lunch

South East Asia

N/A

UNAIDS

NA

17. 2025 OIG Annual Report

Eastern Mediterranean Region

On the OIG, the thematic audit of high- and extreme-security-risk settings produces a finding the EMRC considers pivotal—moderate to excellent programmatic performance, yet off-track for 2030 for reasons largely outside implementer control. The governance conclusion follows

directly: GC8 transition timelines must be calibrated to the operating environment, country preparedness and service-continuity capacity, not to Grant Cycle schedules alone. In countries where health services remain heavily dependent on external financing, humanitarian delivery platforms and non-governmental implementers, transition decisions must not reduce access to essential services. We ask the Board to commission a focused OIG advisory on transition readiness and country preparedness in fragile and COE settings in time to inform the next relevant GC8 funding-request window and implementation decisions. We also ask that the GC8 assurance recalibration plan, when presented to the AFC, explicitly consider Qualitative Adjustment Factors (QAF), the Cost of Essential Programming (CoEP), population displacement and mobility, and the need to maintain or increase oversight intensity in high- and extreme-security-risk portfolios. Efficiency gains in the assurance model should not reduce compliance protection in the settings that need it most.

Japan/Republic of Korea

- We highly commend the OIG's agile response in striving to balance the strengthening of audit and control functions with operational improvements, particularly within a constrained budgetary environment, and including the flexibility in audit methodologies such as the introduction of Rapid Assurance. In the current environment of escalating and diverse risks, we recognize that timely risk assessment and corresponding rapid responses are more crucial than ever.
- As highlighted at the Board meeting in February this year, we remain deeply concerned about the Agreed Management Actions (AMA) completion rate, which has remained around 20% over the past three years. We note that for 2026, OIG, in collaboration with the Audit and Finance Committee (AFC), plans to review the AMA process and related KPIs, aiming to enhance effectiveness and strengthen impact measurement. We will closely monitor these efforts.
- While the internal control framework itself has been steadily strengthened, we regret that instances of fraud and insufficient compliance with rules continue to be observed at the country level. The global health landscape remains challenging, and ensuring accountability and visibility for external assistance is critically important. Therefore, while the crucial role of OIG's oversight function in this regard is self-evident, we believe that efforts to reduce risks are equally important.

Developed Country NGO

Our Delegation commends the leadership the OIG has demonstrated during this period of significant uncertainty. We particularly value the rapid assurance reviews undertaken in 2025, which provided timely and essential guidance during critical decision-making periods.

We appreciate the OIG's reflections on the risks and challenges around domestic resource mobilization and co-financing as the backbone for transition and sustainability. We are supportive of the OIG reviews planned in 2026, with particular interest in the review of the Global Funds Approach to support transition under GC8 and GC9. This review cannot come soon enough.

Communities

The Communities Delegation strongly supports the 2025 OIG Annual Report as independent, evidence-based oversight of exactly the kind this period of financial and operational volatility demands. Its findings substantiate concerns this Delegation has already raised with the Board. Community Systems Strengthening remains the underinvested foundation of integration, persistently capped well below what integration requires, and the OIG's finding of a wide gap between RSSH absorption and non-RSSH absorption, despite a significant increase in GC7 investment, confirms that the deficit sits not only in allocation but in implementation, where national disease programs frequently lack the mandate or competence to deliver community and systems activities.

The OIG's own warning that the cumulative addition of priorities, including community engagement, has occurred without explicit articulation of trade-offs is a direct signal that community engagement funding is precisely the line item at risk of silent deprioritization as GC8 recalibrates. We ask that any such trade-offs be made explicit to the Board and AFC, and that GC8 RSSH/CSS allocations designate community-led entities as eligible implementers, consistent with the direct-funding architecture this Delegation has previously proposed.

We further note that transition risk remains the sole High/Very High risk area the OIG has not yet reviewed, and ask that its 2026 scope explicitly assess service continuity for key and vulnerable populations. In the same spirit of measurement discipline we have called for in supply chain stewardship, we ask that community-led monitoring and RSSH investment be held to the same standard: defined, tracked value-for-money metrics, rather than prioritization by precedent. Finally, with OIG capacity itself visibly constrained, posts unfilled, recruitment on hold, investigation timelines running well past target, and a marked drop in complaints attributed to reduced country engagement rather than fewer problems, we ask the Board to seek assurance that SEAH and country-level investigative capacity, including the proportion of this work currently performed by the Local Fund Agent, be tracked as GC8 begins.

West and Central Africa

The constituencies welcome the OIG's overall positive assurance opinion, confirming that the Global Fund's governance, risk management and internal control systems remain broadly effective. At the same time, the report sends a clear message that the greatest risks facing the Global Fund are no longer internal controls, but the external financing environment, implementation capacity and the increasing demands being placed on country systems. ESA and WCA welcome the OIG's emphasis on prioritisation, simplification and value for money. As the Global Fund enters a more resource-constrained period, grant ambition must be matched by realistic implementation capacity, and difficult trade-offs must be made transparently and consistently. We also encourage continued focus on the timely implementation of Agreed Management Actions, ensuring that audit findings translate into measurable improvements in programme delivery and organisational performance. Ultimately, strengthening country systems and implementation capacity will be the most important safeguard for sustaining impact.

South East Asia

TBA

UNAIDS

The UNAIDS Constituency thanks the Office of the Inspector General for its continued independent oversight and welcomes the Annual Report.

Independent assurance, strong internal controls, and transparent oversight remain fundamental to protecting the integrity of Global Fund investments and sustaining confidence across the partnership. We welcome the OIG's continued attention to identifying systemic risks, promoting organizational learning, and supporting the timely implementation of agreed management actions.

As implementation of Grant Cycle 8 begins, continued focus on strengthening country systems—including procurement and supply management, governance, and programme delivery—will remain essential to protecting impact and ensuring that investments reach the people and communities most affected by HIV, tuberculosis and malaria.

We also note the OIG's observation that accelerated transition pathways can present significant risks, particularly for vulnerable and marginalized populations. As partners, we

share a collective responsibility to ensure that transition processes do no harm. This requires sustained collaboration, early planning, and support for countries to strengthen the systems, financing, and community-led responses needed to safeguard equitable access to services and preserve hard-won health gains.

Point Seven

Point Seven welcomes the OIG's 2025 Annual Report and thanks the Inspector General and her team for a timely, candid and strategically relevant assessment.

We note positively the OIG's overall opinion that nothing that came to its attention would significantly compromise the Global Fund's overall strategic and operational objectives. We also commend the OIG for adapting its assurance model through rapid reviews and advisories, which appears to have provided relevant and timely oversight in a fast-changing environment.

At the same time, the report makes clear that the Global Fund is entering a more constrained phase, where ambition, resources and implementation realities must be more closely aligned. Point Seven agrees with the OIG that implementation capacity at country level remains a critical determinant of results. This is especially true for RSSH investments, fragile settings, and complex portfolios. As we move into GC8, realistic prioritization and stronger implementation readiness will be essential.

We also take note of the report's message that differentiation and simplification must go further. In a tighter resource environment, the Global Fund will need sharper prioritization, clearer trade-offs, and more streamlined processes. This should include continued attention to value for money, reducing unnecessary complexity, and ensuring that scarce technical and operational capacity is focused where it adds the most value.

Point Seven is also concerned by the findings related to non-compliant expenditure, procurement weaknesses, conflicts of interest and delayed contracting. Strong recovery mechanisms are important, but prevention is even more important. We therefore encourage continued strengthening of integrity measures, procurement oversight and control measures at country level.

Finally, we welcome the report's emphasis on the need to evolve risk management from a largely compliance-oriented model toward one that better supports strategic prioritization and risk-informed decision-making. In the current context, this will be essential to protect both impact and donor confidence.

In conclusion, we encourage Management and the Board to take these findings forward with urgency and discipline.

18. Approach to Evidence and Learning

Latin America and Caribbean

Future of the Evaluation Function: Approach to Evidence & Learning - GF/B55/11

As already stated, LAC is greatly concerned that the current evaluation (and even more so Learning) function lacks the agility needed for a fast-moving in a high-risk environment based on OIG audits findings. We appreciate and support the acceleration of the process provided by the Secretariat, appropriate for a large and functional Multilateral Entity concerned about efficiency and vigilant of its own reputation.

- **Timeliness:** Processes are too lengthy, and in addition external auditors often lack the operational nuance of the Global Fund, leading to evaluations that conclude too late to inform real-time decision-making.
- **The "How" of Evaluation:** Before defining "what" to evaluate, we welcome the discussion on how to make best use of existing M&E, assurance and strategic review instruments and mechanisms that involve different groups within the Secretariat. We also need to strike a balance between internal expertise and outsourced evaluators to ensure results are functional, timely, and complementary to the KPI framework and all other available data.

LAC fully concurs with Secretariat approach, based on SC request, that emphasises the need for more limited and focused external evaluations, with targeted independent external evaluations commissioned selectively in areas where independence, depth, or methodological rigor or subject matter expertise is particularly critical, brings additional value for money and/or where internal evidence is insufficient.

Therefore, LAC supports the redesign option that seeks to adopt an integrated evidence and learning system, with the **Strategy and Policy Hub of the Secretariat (SPH) and OIG** as core pillars and external evaluation by exception.

We think it would be helpful to provide some concrete examples of topics and situations for which external support may be appropriate and outline the process to trigger such actions.

World Health Organization

WHO welcomes the proposed shift toward a more **integrated, agile and decision oriented approach to evidence and learning**, aligned with the need for timely and relevant insights to support decisionmaking in a constrained environment.

This function should support **forward looking, learning oriented analysis**, including early identification of risks and testing of key assumptions underpinning GC8 shifts, particularly prioritization, transition and integration. As these shifts are implemented, it will be important to generate timely evidence on their implications for communities, service delivery and equitable access to services, particularly for key and vulnerable populations, to help inform adaptive decision-making and course correction where needed.

As reliance on internal evidence synthesis increases, it will be important to ensure that **sufficient independence and strategic challenges are preserved**, so that evaluation efforts continue to add value in navigating complexity and uncertainty across diverse country contexts.

Eastern Mediterranean Region

The evaluations synthesized in the CELO Learning Report deliver a consistent and independent verdict: community systems strengthening (CSS) operationalization has not kept pace with strategic commitments; community actors face persistent power asymmetries in funding-allocation processes; and recommendation uptake remains low. These findings are not new to the EMRC — but they are now in the independent evaluation record, and we ask that they directly and formally inform GC8 CSS investment guidance.

On the future of the evaluation function, the EMRC welcomes the Secretariat's efforts to strengthen the connection between evidence, learning, and decision-making, and acknowledges the genuine governance challenge that low recommendation uptake has represented. We engage with this proposal in a constructive spirit.

The EMRC welcomes the clarification that external independent evaluations would continue where evidence gaps, technical complexity or objectivity require them, while emphasizing that OIG assurance should complement, not replace, independent evaluation of impact, sustainability and transition.

At the same time, we would respectfully ask the Board to consider whether consolidating accountability for evidence and learning within the Secretariat, alongside the dissolution of dedicated independent oversight bodies, adequately preserves the balance between operational integration and institutional independence that has underpinned confidence in the Global Fund's evaluation function. We note that institutions frequently cited as points of reference in global health and development finance — including the World Bank, UNDP and GCF — maintain a clear separation between evaluation accountability and Secretariat management. We do not raise this comparison to be prescriptive, but to underscore that independent reporting to a governing body is broadly regarded as a foundational governance standard, not an exceptional one.

The EMRC therefore requests that: independent reporting to the Board through the Strategy Committee be explicitly preserved and codified; robust and transparent quality-assurance safeguards be defined; an independent evaluation of GC8 transition implementation be planned; the criteria and accountability arrangements for commissioning external independent evaluations be published; and the staffing and budget implications of the proposed model be disclosed. In the EMRC's view, the proposed process is not yet sufficiently mature for a final structural decision, and further Board and constituency discussion is needed before an appropriate decision is made.

Japan/Republic of Korea

- In the proposed approach, we highly appreciate the emphasis on positioning evaluation not as an end in itself, but as a means to inform decision-making, with a focus on providing evidence directly relevant to decision-making. Furthermore, leveraging existing evidence and shifting to a demand-driven approach are considered rational responses within limited resources. While we generally support the proposal, the following three points still require careful consideration:
- Ensuring Independence and Objectivity: We must be mindful of ensuring the independence and objectivity of analysis, as well as the potential for increased reliance on Secretariat-led analysis and interpretation. Specifically, it seems crucial to clarify in advance, with a view to actual implementation, at what stages independent reviews or external perspectives will be ensured.
- Consistency with the Office of the Inspector General's Role and Burden: While the Office of Inspector General (OIG) is expected to play a critical role in ensuring independence, consideration must be given to consistency with its regular operations and priorities. It remains important to ensure that this approach can function effectively without placing an undue burden on OIG.
- Feasibility of a Rapid and Effective Evidence Provision Mechanism: The realization of this model will require securing advanced analytical capabilities, particularly within the Strategic Policy Hub (SPH), and a certain level of resource allocation. Given that establishing a system that balances both rapidity and effectiveness is not easy, we would like to request an explanation from the Secretariat on how it intends to support this mechanism going forward.

Developed Country NGO

Our Delegation is grateful for the acceleration of the response, given the opportunity to move to a higher-impact model faster and enable cost savings. By advancing this proposal more quickly, we are able to free up valuable governance time in October to focus on mission-level threats which deserve additional Strategy Committee and Board attention. This includes dedicated focus on post-transition support and mitigating the risks of transition, threats to community systems, and the crisis in malaria.

We are supportive of the new approach to evaluation and learning, and we are keen to see that it is advanced. However, we are very clear that this approach does not come without risks or tradeoffs.

We would like to ensure that decision-making around when to further enlist the OIG or

a fully external evaluation is not limited to only instances of conflict of interest, but to also account for understandable and natural bias. Our Delegation would like to see a decision-making structure for this with clear input – external from the Secretariat – on when an external view is needed.

We see the tremendously important role of the OIG and SPH/SIID, which is already under strain and growing in its responsibility. We would need to ensure the right expertise is in place, and that this added responsibility does not detract from other mission-critical work. We are very pleased to see the built-in review. We believe the review should examine not only whether “this new model is working” but includes analysis on missing or lost elements by not having a more formal independent evaluation function. We do want to ensure that general accountability is built in, such as who is responsible for checking the internal dialogue.

Communities

The Communities Delegation recognizes the CELO’s work in synthesizing valuable evidence on community systems, and we are grateful to the evaluation teams and the ELO for this contribution. At the same time, we believe this report provides the Board with an important opportunity to honestly assess whether the current model for independent evaluation is serving the partnership as well as it should.

We believe the moment calls for a more fundamental rethink of how the evaluation function is structured, rather than refinements at the margins. In considering the redesign of the current model, the Communities Delegation wishes to anchor any redesign in a few core principles that we consider non-negotiable:

- Participatory and multistakeholder decision-making, ensuring communities and other constituencies retain a genuine voice in shaping evaluation priorities and reviewing findings, not only in being consulted as evaluation subjects.
- Transparency, so that the basis for evaluation conclusions and Secretariat responses is visible and traceable to all Board constituencies.
- Accountability, including independent verification that recommendations have been implemented, rather than relying on self-assessment alone.

West and Central Africa

We continue to support a more agile, practical and learning-oriented evaluation approach, building on our previous recommendation that large consultant-led evaluations be replaced, where appropriate, by smaller, more targeted analyses that better meet the needs of the Secretariat and Board.

Given the current financial environment, the cost of the function and the findings of the OIG review, ESA and WCA believe it is timely to consider whether the current evaluation model remains the most effective approach. Learning could instead be strengthened through the OIG’s existing work together with more targeted analytical capacity within the Secretariat, with greater emphasis on capturing and sharing country-level lessons that improve implementation across the partnership.

Western Pacific Region

The Western Pacific constituency thanks the Secretariat and the Office of the Inspector General for a candid paper. We support the direction of the proposed shift to an integrated evidence and learning model, given that the current evaluation function is ineffective, costly and little used.

Our support is subject to five points.

1. Independence in substance. The safeguards, namely the OIG’s system-level assurance, transparent methods, and a genuinely protected external-evaluation budget, must be firm and reported on.

2.Impact evaluation.As the OIG cannot evaluate programme impact, the Secretariat should be explicit about how independent evaluation of health impact will be assured.

3.Transition and sustainability.Independent, forward-looking evidence on transition must be safeguarded, and not crowded out by a demand-driven, internally set agenda.

4.Responsive, country-led learning.The model should strengthen fast, practical feedback to countries and implementers, developed together with technical in-country and community partners, so that learning translates into the maximum health impact where programmes are delivered.

5.Process. As this change touches the Bylaws and the Fund's independence architecture, constituencies must be able to shape the final proposal before any decision, and the planned review of the new model, at 18 to 24 months, should report to the full Board.

With these assurances, the Western Pacific constituency is ready to support the proposed approach

South East Asia

SEA Constituency would like to thank and realize the findings of the OIG review of the Independent Evaluation Function and subsequent document proposed by the Secretariat on the Approach to Evidence and Learning for discussion of the Future of Evaluation Function. We are absolutely convinced of the importance, the value and the impact of the independent evaluation function on steering of the organisation, strategic decision-making, and accountability.

Given the SC discussion on the future of evaluation and learning at the Global Fund, we fully agree with the SC input on the purpose “what evaluative insights are needed” and scope “who are the primary user/audience and at what point in decision-making” and “how that insight is best generated and used”. Emphasising organisational learning and greater value for money and resourcing, while ensuring the quality and safeguarding independence of evaluations, is extremely challenging within the broader evidence ecosystem.

To reflect the approach to evaluation, SEA Constituency express our grave concern and reiterates our position on the following key messages.

1. Installing an independent evaluation structure, separate from the Secretariat function, is a fundamental principle to reflect the effectiveness and efficiency of investment and avoid internal bias. It upholds the check and balance level within the Global Fund governance framework. The OIG audit function is well-preserved of independence but not replacing the evaluation function.
2. In-depth evidence is needed to address what causal pain points of the ineffective evaluation function and less value for money are, whether they rely on the independent structure itself, the Independent Evaluation Panel's performance and its working mechanism or the complex relationship among SC, IEP, ELO and the Secretariat.
3. We are deeply concerned about the Secretariat's proposal approach of evaluation swiftly jumping into only one single solution without adequate analysis of its future impact. That will entail dissolving the ELO and the IEP and proposing that the Secretariat by SPH will ensure accountability for the evidence and learning across the organization, and a complementary role for the OIG in contributing strategic reviews and advisories, alongside independent assurance including evaluations and learning.

To the Board input, we would like to express our disagreement on dissolving whatever independent evaluation core component and functions of the Global Fund and left inappropriate burdens on the OIG, the SC and the Secretariat. Furthermore, we recommend the Secretariat for robust review and propose more options for the future of evaluation. At this

stage, we would like to share our opinions for a new model as (1) close coordination and strong oversight of the SC with the evaluation function are critical and needed strengthening, (2) more effort on prioritization of evaluation for decisions and greater value of money including scrutinized external evaluation, (3) redesigning integrative working model of independent evaluation function, replacing MYEC with agile, quality and effective framework of evaluation to need of strategic decisions and learning.

SEA Constituency realize the importance and implication of the future of evaluation and learning to the Global Fund and we would like to express our strong willingness to contribute further to the Board in this regard.

UNAIDS

The UNAIDS Constituency welcomes the proposed shift towards a more agile, demand-driven approach to evidence and learning that better supports country decision-making, adaptive implementation and strategic prioritization.

In a constrained resource environment, evidence should help countries and partners make better decisions—not simply generate more reports. We therefore support greater emphasis on timely, practical evidence that is aligned with decision-making windows and implementation needs.

We welcome the proposal to better leverage existing internal and external evidence before commissioning new analyses. Drawing on epidemiological data, programme experience, partner evidence and community perspectives can strengthen both learning and decision-making while making more efficient use of resources.

We support the proposed safeguards to preserve the credibility, independence and quality of the evidence base, recognizing that independent assurance remains essential where it adds the greatest value.

We welcome the commitment to review the new approach following implementation and encourage continued assessment of whether it is generating timely, actionable evidence that improves implementation and strengthens country impact.

Point Seven

Point Seven acknowledges the findings of the OIG audit of the Independent Evaluation Function and appreciate the proactive follow-up by the Secretariat and the opportunity to give input to the proposal for change during the board meeting.

We note positively that this proposal comes from a comprehensive process with input from SC members and consultations with OIG and with several options considered.

The proposal to redesign the Global Fund's approach to evaluation is welcome, moving towards an integrated evidence and learning model. It is positive that the Global Fund will systematically utilize existing evidence more, both internal and external, for decision making.

This redesign will strengthen accountability, learning and evidence-based decision making and is cost-efficient in a time where funds are limited and the needs are still high at country level.

However, this approach does rise some concerns around maintaining the important aspect of independence. We note that external evaluations will still be needed for some areas and we

would advise that these areas are identified and planned for by still keeping the multi-year evaluation calendar. The process of identifying external evaluation topics should be a broad and participatory process reviewed by an independent body. Follow up of findings from these evaluations should be reported annually to the Board. An independent analysis of program reach and impact is important for transparency and accountability.

We also want to acknowledge the efforts needed to follow up the proposed redesign and want to emphasize the importance of ensuring that both OIG and SPH have the capacity and resources to take on these additional responsibilities effectively.

European Commission, Belgium, Italy, Portugal, Spain

We endorse the objectives of efficiency and agility in the future evaluation model. However, independence must remain the central pillar guiding this reform, not a secondary consideration.

- Structural guarantee of independent challenge: with the proposal to essentially dissolve the Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP), we ask what guarantee of independent challenge will remain within the new model. We oppose giving up independent advice and quality oversight also in light of reputational risks.
- Independent impact and outcome evaluation: given that the OIG is Charter-barred from impact evaluation, we ask how independent impact and outcome evaluation will be assured going forward. OIG system-level assurance is necessary but is not a substitute for evaluating whether programs actually work.
- Transparent trigger mechanism: we request a clear, transparent mechanism defining when and how the Decision Pathway for independent external evaluation is triggered, so that this function cannot simply wither over time.
- Ring-fenced funding floor: a ring-fenced, multi-year funding floor for independent external evaluation work, including the overseeing of the evaluations, protecting it from being squeezed out in leaner budget years.
- Right to commission: an explicit right for the Strategy Committee and the Board — not only the Secretariat — to commission independent evaluations, with the Strategy Committee's named priority areas (including GC8 shifts, transition and blended finance) serving as a useful starting list.

Evaluating the new evaluation model: we note that the Secretariat proposes that the OIG audit the new model after 18-24 months and strongly suggest that this evaluation is externalized given the central role and direct involvement of the OIG in this proposal.

19. Coffee

South East Asia

N/A

UNAIDS

NA

20. Global Health Ecosystem including Global Fund-Gavi Collaboration Update

Latin America and Caribbean

Global Health Ecosystem including Global Fund-Gavi Collaboration Update- GF/B55/12

Recognizing that the GF operating model needs to evolve to better deliver its mission, and the fast-evolving Global Health ecosystem, LAC would like to recommend the Board to further discuss how to continue driving this meaningful change without compromising organization effectiveness during this process, with particular emphasis on the expected immediate impact of internal shifts required in 2026. Furthermore, we would like to draw attention to the potential risk of continuously accelerate the Secretariat restructuring process without having sufficient evidence on the impact of the simplification processes on Secretariat staff and its capacity to support countries.

LAC is fully aligned with the principle of delivering synergies with other partners, to align roles, reduce duplication and fragmentation, and maximise complementarity, while maintaining flexibility and adjust joint collaborations to country contexts and needs. LAC commends the GF and Gavi for their commitment to actively pursue efficiencies and synergies, moving towards concrete collaboration on malaria and TB at country level. Conscious of the challenges of a potential of GAVI and the GF merge in terms of protecting their mandates, accountability, representation, and governance organizational effectiveness at different levels, including CCMs at country level, LAC would like to recommend pausing any restructuring process, while continue exploring joint collaboration initiatives to ensure greater simplification at the country level.

Regarding the proposed TB vaccine collaboration, LAC notes that current modelling suggests a 50% effectiveness. Successful deployment would require high delivery costs, including cold chain logistics and pharmacovigilance. Based on the high costs, moderate efficacy and limited uptake seen in recent malaria vaccine rollouts, we must weigh this against other advancements, such as near-point-of-care (NPOC) molecular tests and shorter WHO-recommended directly observed TB preventive therapy.

LAC would like to pose the following questions for Board consideration:

1. In a constrained fiscal environment, how do we explicitly define and measure the added value of investing in a vaccine that demonstrates limited cost-effectiveness?

2. How can the Global Fund strategically balance resource allocation between this vaccine opportunity and investments in near-point-of-care (NPOC) molecular testing to accelerate early diagnosis and timely treatment?

Drawing from the insights gained through recent external mappings and internal reflections, the LAC Constituency highly appreciates this opportunity to provide additional input. We look forward to actively engaging in discussions regarding the Global Fund's future direction and core strengths at the upcoming Board Retreat.

World Health Organization

WHO welcomes the strengthening of the Global Fund-Gavi collaboration, and the positioning of this within Global Health Architecture discussions. WHO welcomes the Global Fund's active engagement in the joint process to be hosted by WHO, which will bring together current reform discussions and UN80 proposals with potential implications for global health, and, as needed, complement these with additional evidence-gathering, research, and consultation to develop a common framework for the global health architecture. As discussed at the Gavi Board, WHO would welcome and appreciate if the Global Fund and Gavi would share the work done on the collaboration with the secretariat of the WHO-hosted joint process.

WHO encourages that the Gavi–Global Fund collaboration considers a sequenced approach, framed by considerations of where the partnership might be over the next 5-10 years (rather than current constraints), while focused on immediate opportunities within the current institutional structures. There are opportunities to acknowledge and

build on lessons from collaboration in malaria and explore further opportunities for collaboration and coordination on TB. More complex structural changes might be considered at a later stage.

As this partnership deepens, including in areas such as TB and malaria, clear and complementary institutional roles will be important to support coherence and avoid fragmentation. Boards may need to consider their organizations' respective roles, financing approaches, incentives, and ways of working. Gavi and the Global Fund may also consider how they work with others through their collaboration, including to best leverage WHO's strategic and normative mandate. For example, WHO welcomes the engagement of Gavi and the Global Fund in the WHO led TB Vaccine Accelerator Council and encourages continued collaboration to advance TB vaccines alongside other interventions (social, diagnostic, therapeutic and other) as part of an integrated approach to TB and other key innovations in a coordinated, country focused manner.

At a time when both Gavi and Global Fund are emphasizing integrated primary health care and health systems strengthening, it is important that investments in cross-cutting health systems functions are protected rather than reduced. Both Global Fund and Gavi investments should increasingly support shared national health systems priorities and country systems. In the longer-term, this might include consideration of pooled investment in cross-cutting health systems priorities, joint planning, aligned funding and budget cycles, and greater use of national plans, budgets, and implementation mechanisms. WHO's normative leadership, technical guidance, stewardship, and country support – including on priority setting, health benefit packages, health technology assessment, costing, public financial management, and integrated service delivery – are also foundational to these shared health systems priorities and to sustainable transition.

Eastern Mediterranean Region

The EMRC supports the three-pathway engagement framework and commends the Secretariat for a principled response to a genuinely complex set of choices. We endorse the five prioritized collaboration bundles and the decision to pause institutional and structural options, and we ask that this remains the agreed scope until both Boards have established full information parity and aligned strategic direction.

On the Gavi collaboration, we have three specific concerns for our region.

First, TB ambition is disproportionately low. Successive Committee steers, including in May 2026, identified TB as the leading focus and called for the malaria work to serve as a learning model. Yet the TB bundle sits at the least-developed stage — a project team to identify opportunities — while our constituency carries a substantial burden of TB and drug-resistant TB, amplified by conflict, displacement and diagnostic disruption. The gap between stated priority and actual investment is not sustainable. We ask that the TB bundle be accelerated through a costed plan with concrete scope, milestones and financing options, drawing directly on the emerging malaria-bundle lessons. The plan should use efficiencies, catalytic resources and additional financing opportunities to expand access to rapid molecular and near-point-of-care (NPOC) diagnostics, strengthen laboratory and supply-chain resilience, sustain treatment continuity, and support progress toward the End TB Strategy targets.

Second, the consultative base is too thin for a collaboration whose central justification is country ownership. Four country consultations with no visible CCM or implementer-group input are not an adequate foundation for moving from scoping to design. We ask that any such move include direct consultation with CCMs, implementers and affected communities, with explicit attention to fragile, conflict-affected and humanitarian contexts, including refugees, internally displaced persons and mobile populations.

Third, on administrative burden: the Taskforce's own assessment warns that aligning grant-cycle timing without first simplifying underlying processes can backfire — concentrating applications into a single moment and increasing workload. In countries with fragmented coordination and limited absorptive capacity, this risk is especially serious. We support Bundle

1 only where it delivers clear, demonstrable simplification, and we ask that fragile and COE settings be explicitly stress-tested before any GC9/Gavi 7 rollout.

On the wider ecosystem: we ask the Board to anchor the Fund's engagement in the Accra Reset High-Level Panel, the WHO-hosted process, and the MOPAN comparative-advantage review in an explicit commitment to preserve the Fund's operational model in fragile and COE settings. This is where the Fund's comparative advantage is most distinctive and most at risk of being rationalized away in ecosystem-efficiency discussions not designed with those settings in mind. We would also welcome clarity on how the Board will receive and respond to recommendations emerging from these external processes before they mature into institutional positions.

Japan/Republic of Korea

- We appreciate that the Global Fund is appropriately addressing the significant changes in the global health ecosystem by re-evaluating its own role. In particular, the framework that integrates three pathways is appropriate from the perspective of maximizing impact at country-level. We fundamentally support this approach.
- However, it is not appropriate for such discussions to lead to an indefinite expansion of the Global Fund's mandate. In an environment of tightening resource constraints, it is crucial to clearly define "where to concentrate" efforts, building on the Global Fund's comparative advantages.
- Regarding collaboration with Gavi, assuming immediate large-scale institutional integration or radical restructuring is not realistic. Considering the costs, time, and governance complexities involved, we believe an approach that progressively deepens collaboration, starting with practically feasible and less burdensome areas, such as process alignment, information sharing, and specific joint activities, is appropriate. We support this realistic and incremental direction.
- Furthermore, the insights gained from practical collaboration with Gavi are significant not only for individual partnerships but also for the overall restructuring and reform of the global health architecture. We expect these practical learnings to feed into broader discussions on institutional reform.

Developed Country NGO

The Board is asked to comment first on whether we agree with the proposed three-pathway approach and provide guidance on where attention should be most focused, particularly in the broader reform discussions. And secondly, following the joint technical briefing, on what are the most impactful areas to focus.

Our Delegation sees the three-pathway approach as correct, but we would appreciate any insights that can be shared during the Secretariat and Committee updates on this agenda item on whether there were other approaches that the GFS considered strongly, but ultimately rejected or reframed, and for what reasons (such as resource constraints, gaps in technical expertise or alignment between institutions, varying appetite for risk in the areas, etc.).

In the Strategic Performance Report, given how far off-track the TB prevention KPI is, we welcome the strong focus on TB within the five "bundles" of areas for collaboration with Gavi presented in this report. We have already seen the consequences for malaria, when different pools of funding meant that decisions about the right blend of interventions – which should be decisions based on the epidemiology and country context – were instead driven by what funding was available and for which tools.

West and Central Africa

The WCA and ESA constituencies support the proposed approach to the evolving global health ecosystem and encourage the Secretariat to remain focused on the Global Fund's comparative advantage and core mission of delivering impact for countries. Collaboration with WHO, Gavi, the World Bank, Africa CDC and other partners should be judged by whether it reduces the burden on countries, simplifies administrative and grant processes and reporting, and strengthens country-led implementation.

ESA and WCA support the proposed focus on TB collaboration, including preparations for TB vaccine introduction, through joint country planning, coordinated financing and aligned procurement pathways. *What lessons have we learned from the malaria vaccine introduction that should be applied to TB?* What is our collective strategy to encourage collaboration and avoid unnecessary competition between the two institutions and the programs at country level?

We also encourage the Secretariat and partners to reflect on the lessons of previous global effectiveness initiatives, including the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action, to ensure that current reform efforts achieve more meaningful and lasting results.

Western Pacific Region

The Western Pacific Region Constituency supports the proposed three-pathway framework as an effective approach to responding to the evolving global health ecosystem. We encourage the Global Fund to assess the pathways through a country lens, prioritizing reforms that reduce fragmentation, strengthen country ownership and community leadership, and improve partner alignment. We also encourage the Global Fund to leverage its strengths in implementation, market shaping, and partnerships while contributing to broader health architecture reform. Finally, we urge explicit consideration of Pacific Island countries and other vulnerable states to ensure reforms deliver measurable benefits for countries and communities.

Building on these principles, the Western Pacific Constituency would like to highlight four priorities for implementation.

- Reforms should deliver tangible benefits for countries by simplifying processes, reducing transaction costs, and strengthening integrated, sustainable service delivery, with particular attention to the needs of countries that have ongoing epidemic or lower capacity.
- We encourage the Global Fund and Gavi to deepen collaboration in areas where joint action can have the greatest impact, including health financing, supply chains, health workforce development, community engagement, data systems, and integrated primary health care.
- We encourage continued collaboration across HIV, TB and malaria programmes. Joint planning and investment through the malaria and TB roadmaps can improve efficiency, strengthen country readiness, and accelerate the introduction of future innovations, including new TB vaccines and prevention technologies.
- As the Secretariat takes forward the three-pathway framework, we encourage priority attention to Roadmaps 2 and 3, with Roadmaps 4 and 5 serving as cross-cutting enablers, to ensure that reforms translate into practical, measurable improvements for countries and communities.

South East Asia

This topic asks the Board to endorse a pathway framework without fully answering the question the Strategy Committee itself raised in May: what does ringfencing pathways two and three mean in practice? The paper calls for a more disciplined and targeted approach, but it does not set out clear criteria for when the Secretariat should lead, partner, or step back. That matters because the Secretariat is restructuring much of its workforce while also engaging in several major global health reform processes.

The paper does not mention South-East Asia or any SEA country, so we draw no regional evidence from it. But for implementing constituencies, Secretariat capacity is not an abstract issue. If engagement across global processes expands without clear priorities, country-facing support is more likely to come under pressure.

We ask the Secretariat to bring to the October Board meeting a simple mapping of its engagement across the major reform processes, indicating where the Global Fund intends to lead, where it will partner, and where it will monitor developments, together with the broad level of Secretariat capacity assigned to each. That will allow the Board to judge whether the three pathways are being applied consistently with the principle of comparative advantage.

Point Seven

Since 2000, mortality from AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria has declined significantly, a clear evidence of what political will, scientific progress, and multilateral cooperation can achieve. These hard-won gains must be protected.

At the same time, the current system has inherent weaknesses. Earmarked funding, vertical programmes, and parallel structures have created lock-in effects, inefficiencies, and persistent power imbalances between the Global North and South. As donors, we acknowledge that we need to take responsibility and contribute positively to change this reality.

Declining levels of ODA have created both a challenge and an opportunity. While the current financing constraints demonstrate that the existing model is no longer sustainable, they also open a window for necessary and overdue reform.

Strong national ownership is essential. Reforms must be grounded in countries' own priorities, budget cycles, institutions, and financing, with external actors playing a supporting rather than steering role.

There is also a clear shift in expectations. As highlighted by the Accra Reset Panel, many countries are calling for less aid and greater autonomy. Low- and middle-income countries increasingly seek to lead and finance their own health development, with a stronger focus on regional production, innovation, and capacity building.

The Global Fund must remain open to change, as part of pathway 1. Improved coordination and collaboration across the global health landscape is essential to reduce fragmentation, duplication and transaction costs. Point Seven would like to see a Fund that is more aligned with national systems, plans, and priorities and that is country-driven, and efficient. This requires closer and more coherent collaboration between Gavi and the Global Fund, in line with pathway 2, including greater harmonisation of governance, reporting, applications and follow-up requirements, as noted in the joint Nordic+ and Point Seven constituency statement.

Opportunities for efficiency gains extend beyond these two institutions. Attention should also be given to the roles of WHO, UNICEF, the World Bank, and other global health initiatives in fostering more coherent and country-focused support. These discussions should be closely linked to ongoing global health architecture reform processes to ensure alignment across the system. Achieving stronger country ownership, reduced duplication, and greater coherence—as envisaged in frameworks such as the Lusaka Agenda and the Accra Reset—may ultimately require not only improved coordination but also continued exploration of more structural approaches over time.

In this context, Point Seven sees the Global Fund as a key partner in these reform processes. As one of the world's largest global health financing institutions, the Global Fund has played a pivotal role in the fight against HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. Advancing such achievements in a new era will require the Fund to continue evolving—adapting to a changing landscape while playing an active and constructive role to help shaping a coherent future global health ecosystem.

21. Closing

South East Asia

N/A

UNAIDS

NA

22. Written Updates

South East Asia

UNAIDS

NA

22.1 Update on Resource Mobilization and the 8th Replenishment

Developed Country NGO

We welcome the update and specifics on additional pledges from “Other Donors”, as of end-March 2026.

We welcome the roles played in an incredibly complex environment for both co-host governments individually, as well as within a volatile geopolitical environment during the 8th Replenishment (8R). Yet our Delegation would like to raise that, even though co-hosting was a significant innovation in itself, it is not as clear that it was a successful innovation as implemented for the 8th Replenishment. We fully support the Global Fund Secretariat’s aspiration and the principles behind having both an implementing and donor country government to co-host. We also recognize the challenge of addressing learnings from the model and the specific example that 8R provides.

However, co-hosting comes with significant additional responsibilities for the Secretariat and the need for strong coordination. Additionally, while ultimately the amount(s) that donors pledge is not attributable directly to any single external influence, we strongly encourage setting a minimum expectation that any co-host at least maintain their previous pledge as a commitment and a condition of co-hosting.

In addition to supporting the Secretariat and Partnership in a successful campaign – either by co-hosting or with a single host – comes with the responsibility to contribute towards the ultimate objective of any replenishment campaign (i.e., to raise funds) by setting the bar as high as possible in terms of pledging. This leadership signal from hosts is irreplaceable. As the Secretariat continues to review its 8th Replenishment, **we strongly recommend that the Secretariat look closely at these factors and ensure that it pulls general lessons learned from the specific experience of 8R to set a clear understanding of and expectations for a successful hosting or co-hosting model.**

We recognize the positive early signs of 8R pledge conversion and the absolute centrality of ensuring all donor pledges from the 7th and 8th Replenishments are **fully converted**. In addition to the harms to programs and communities, the GC7 reprioritization meant that – rather than focusing all attention on maximizing program impact in the midst of a broader global crisis – the Secretariat, CCMs, Ministries and communities were pushed to devote significant energy to navigating a de-allocation process. This must be avoided at all costs

during GC8, with full pledge conversion from all donors. Due to a large number of major donors cutting their contributions, and others yet to firmly recommit, the GC8 allocations are already below the reduced GC7 allocations. Any further cuts or failure to convert would have devastating consequences.

South East Asia

The SEA Constituency takes note of this update and commends the Secretariat and co-hosts South Africa and the United Kingdom for securing US\$12.65 billion under highly challenging global conditions, including a historic 23% decline in Official Development Assistance in 2025. Japan's confirmed contribution is welcomed, and the continued leadership of SEA-region donors is recognized and appreciated.

The SEA Constituency requests the following updates through appropriate governance channels. An update on how the financing gap below the US\$18 billion target will be reflected in GC8 country allocations, with particular attention to high-burden SEA countries carrying over 45% of global TB cases and 4 million annual malaria cases. An update on the Ninth Replenishment Lessons Learned process, confirming that implementer constituency perspectives are explicitly captured ahead of the October 2026 deadline. And an update on strategies to deepen engagement with emerging donors and private sector actors across the SEA and Asia-Pacific region in future replenishment cycles.

UNAIDS

The UNAIDS Constituency thanks all donors, implementing countries and partners for their continued investment in the Global Fund during an exceptionally challenging global financing environment. While the Eighth Replenishment represents a significant achievement, the remaining funding gap reinforces the importance of maximizing the impact of every investment and supporting countries to make evidence-based, equitable and sustainable prioritization decisions, including community engagement.

As countries implement the commitments of the Global AIDS Strategy and the 2026 Political Declaration, sustained domestic and international investment will remain essential. We encourage continued efforts to convert pledges into contributions, broaden and diversify the donor base, strengthen domestic resource mobilization and ensure that countries receive the coordinated support needed to build resilient, sustainable and country-led HIV responses.

22.2 Strategic Performance Report

Developed Country NGO

Standard mid-strategy assessment to revise some KPIs based on changes in the environment is appropriate – even more so in this turbulent time. However, this report also notes the possibility of revising Impact KPI Targets based on **replenishment outcomes. Our Delegation cannot support this kind of revision.**

Underperforming on a given KPI is attributed to myriad factors – it is our duty as a Board to understand why we are underperforming on a KPI, including the underlying reasons due to lack of funding. If many donors are reducing investments, as seen in the 8th Replenishment, **we may need to revise our operational plans – but not our ambition.** KPIs cannot predict what will be achieved or how programs are impacted, but serve as a target and a way to hold ourselves mutually accountable. While KPIs are ultimately “actionable by the Secretariat,” if underfunding renders those KPIs unactionable, the Board must take ownership and be held accountable for this underperformance.

In general, our Delegation observes a prioritization issue, in which a great deal of the Board's time and energy is focused on the procurement / NGFPM / market-shaping KPIs – currently deemed as “adequate” and noted with very generalized risks (e.g., supply chain continuity,

conflict disruption, market stability, etc.). By contrast, we see KPIs for community systems strengthening showing “at risk”. For example, KPI S4 has been declining after steady gains in previous years. And there are suboptimal target levels for KPIs on satisfaction with community and civil society engagement in various points of time in GF processes (e.g., with regard to funding proposal development, grant-making, etc.). For example, on KPI C1 and E3a: We have previously raised the dissatisfaction from community surveys about community engagement and the advancement of gender equality across GF grants. Are there updates on how approaches are changing – at least for GC9 – or could the Secretariat indicate when this will be discussed?

Our Delegation finds it counterintuitive to be focusing heavily in areas where existing policies and processes seem to be adequate, while seemingly ignoring – at a governance level – the same level of attention to significant pieces related to community systems strengthening.

We flag that the KPI Performance summary is still based on 2024 results. We would love to see an update on 2025 data – particularly for malaria bednet distribution (which was underachieved in 2024). We understand that the validation of campaign data takes time, and 2025 data may not be fully available, but it would still be helpful to have a general update on the status of the campaigns implemented in 2025, and to what extent the campaigns were disrupted or not with the decline in USAID funding?

South East Asia

The SEA Constituency takes note of this performance update with serious concern. While overall service delivery remains strong, the report confirms the Partnership is off-track to end the three diseases by 2030, a finding particularly alarming for a region bearing over 45% of global TB cases, rising malaria incidence, and below-target HIV prevention progress among key populations and youth.

The SEA Constituency requests the following updates through appropriate governance channels. An update confirming that KPI framework revisions presented to the 56th Board maintain strong monitoring of TB incidence, key population reach, and community system maturity, areas where SEA countries face the steepest gaps. An update on measures to protect HMIS and routine data systems in countries where funding disruptions are eroding monitoring capacity. And an update clarifying that no proposed KPI discontinuation will reduce visibility into areas of critical need for high-burden implementer countries.

UNAIDS

The UNAIDS Constituency welcomes the Strategic Performance Report and its continued focus on results, accountability and learning. As the partnership begins translating the commitments of the Global AIDS Strategy and the 2026 Political Declaration into implementation, timely performance monitoring will be essential to ensure that investments deliver measurable impact for countries and communities.

We encourage continued use of robust epidemiological and programme data to support countries in making difficult strategic choices using the best available evidence throughout Grant Cycle 8. In an increasingly constrained financing environment, performance measurement should support learning, enable timely course correction and ensure that investments continue to protect HIV gains, strengthen country ownership and deliver equitable outcomes for the communities most affected by HIV.

22.3 Report of the Coordinating Group & the Board Leadership

Eastern Mediterranean Region

The Coordinating Group confirms this as a period of heightened risk and active governance adaptation. GF/B55/08 confirms that the ED selection shortlist carries four to five candidates, with a Board decision at BM56 in late October 2026 — concurrent with early GC8 implementation decisions. We ask Board Leadership to communicate the transition timeline with sufficient specificity at this session to allow constituencies to assess implementation-continuity risk. We further ask that no governance enhancement proposal affecting constituency representation or decision-making structures be advanced without full consultation. Governance reform in constrained environments historically disadvantages smaller and more complex constituencies.

Developed Country NGO

The Developed Country NGO Board Delegation stresses that it is important to emphasize civil society and community voices. We appreciate how the report calls “attention to how governance functions remain embedded in [Coordinating Group] discussions, with themes of duty of care, a culture of trust, effective communication and transparency, and protection of equity of voice across the partnership – including for implementer and multi-country constituencies” (p. 4). The report further describes Global Fund governance as “fundamentally strong and firmly rooted in principles of transparency, representation, inclusion and equity” (p. 7).

In preparing for the 55th Board meeting, the Communities, Developed Country NGO, and Developing Country NGO Delegations have flagged several concerns about the delegation arrangements for Board meetings and broader decision-making (see joint letter previously sent to current Board Leadership).

The letter requests the following:

- Greater clarity regarding decision-making authority across the Board, Board Leadership, the Coordinating Group, Committees, and the Secretariat;
- Clear guidance on when decisions affecting Board participation, representation and oversight should be considered by the EGC and elevated to the Board for consideration, rather than being treated solely as operational matters; and
- Future discussions on governance-related changes should include options and trade-offs for Board consideration, particularly where decisions have implications for representation and oversight.

Regarding intersessional engagements, communication, and reporting: While our Delegation appreciates the timeliness of Committee reporting, we have concerns about the accuracy in the reporting.

Communities

The Communities Delegation understands the impetus for governance streamlining. However, we caution that efforts to make governance “sharper, clearer and lighter” must not come at the expense of meaningful participation, equity of voice, or representation of communities. Concentrating decision-making in fewer hands may address certain pressures of the current context, but it also introduces risk at a time when the consequences of decisions are less predictable, and the stakes for the people we represent are high.

Because of this, as the Global Fund adapts governance to a lower-resource, higher-risk environment, safeguards must be built in, not assumed, to ensure community perspectives continue to inform strategic decision-making and oversight. This requires increased transparency, clear documentation of how and where decisions are made, and functioning feedback loops that allow constituencies to see how their input is used. Trust is not preserved by efficiency alone; it is sustained when communities can see the reasoning behind decisions and participate in decision-making.

South East Asia

The SEA Constituency recognizes the efforts reflected in this report and thanks the Coordinating Group and outgoing Board Leadership for their stewardship. The appointment of incoming Board Leadership is welcomed, and a smooth transition that preserves continuity

and implementer trust is encouraged.

The SEA Constituency requests the following updates through appropriate governance channels. An update confirming that governance streamlining measures operationalized ahead of the 56th Board preserve equitable participation for implementer constituencies, consistent with the Coordinating Group's own recognition of this risk. An update on how the July Retreat conclusions on strategic trade-offs and the Global Fund's evolving role will be reflected in governance and programming decisions affecting high-burden, constrained-financing countries. And an update on how implementer constituency input gathered at the Retreat will be formally incorporated into subsequent Board deliberations.

UNAIDS

NA

22.4 Country Funding Update

World Health Organization

WHO welcomes the **update on the delivery performance** of GC7. The scale of **unfunded quality demand (US\$5.7 billion in GC7)** underscores the need for **clear evidence-based, country led prioritization** of Global Fund resources in GC8 and sustained focus on **equitable access to essential services**.

WHO notes the increasing emphasis on **Strategic Initiatives**, including amounts directed toward **market shaping and innovation**. These investments are important and would benefit from **clearer prioritization and assessment of delivery capacity in GC8 to maximize country impact**.

Regarding the update on the **Additional Safeguard Policy**, WHO notes that such mechanisms are applied to **manage implementation risks in high-risk contexts but remain corrective in nature**. WHO therefore emphasizes the importance of **strengthened, coordinated engagement at country level**—bringing together **financial and programmatic actors early and throughout GC8**—to better identify and address **underlying financial management challenges** and reduce reliance on **downstream corrective measures**, while safeguarding **sustainable health impact**.

Eastern Mediterranean Region

The US\$5.7 billion in Unfunded Quality Demand entering GC8 unresolved is the largest single structural financing gap in the system — technically reviewed, quality-assessed demand that the replenishment cycle failed to finance. The EMRC requests disaggregated, constituency-specific UQD data before the next relevant GC8 funding-request and implementation decisions. We also expect clear communication on the criteria applied for ASP revocation and designation, as these decisions carry direct portfolio consequences for several EMRC member countries.

Developed Country NGO

We welcome and congratulate the Secretariat on completing the country-by-country assessments across the Additional Safeguard Policy (ASP) portfolio of countries that were completed since the OIG Advisory Report in October 2024. We appreciate the establishment of country-specific exit criteria. We welcome the news that a country (Djibouti) has met the conditions that were set and that the ASP has been revoked, and that the Secretariat has identified the possibility of two more countries in the coming year, ahead of their respective GC8 applications.

At this time, we would like to re-surface **questions about the support provided to the countries exiting the ASP** that we originally raised at the 52nd Board meeting when the OIG report was discussed. At the time, our Delegation noted the need for clearly defined support and/or technical assistance at the time that countries exit from ASP. Our intention was to ensure that, while risks would remain, they are manageable without recreating the conditions that originally required the ASP to be invoked. We would appreciate a brief written response to the Board before the Committee / Board meetings in October 2026, on whether this kind of support at the time of the ASP exit had been provided.

Since the completion of the ASP review, it is important to reflect whether the ASP is operating as a transparent, proportionate and time-bound transition pathway, rather than a static designation. We would welcome a short written update outlining:

- How many ASP portfolios have shared exit criteria and milestones with relevant country stakeholders;
- How many countries have time-bound plans for full or partial relaxation of safeguards (i.e., if not “by country” – if an individual country has not been publicly identified – then with a general table).
- What technical assistance, capacity strengthening and assurance support will accompany the ASP exit; and
- How the Secretariat will assess the cost, effectiveness, and programmatic consequences of safeguard measures.

In cases where the risks have been sufficiently reduced, we encourage the progressive removal of individual measures and increased national responsibility, rather than waiting for every risk to disappear before considering change.

On the Catalytic Investment Strategic Initiatives (SIs), nearly half of the total value of the USD 264 million approved for SIs is for the NextGen priority. At the 54th Board meeting, our Delegation raised concerns about sub-optimally funded CIs, many of which would be Strategic Initiatives. Given the concerns raised in the Strategy Performance Report (GF/B55/14), and KPI S4, in particular, our Delegation once again highlights that we are significantly underinvesting in CIs linked to some of the KPIs that get at the complex intersectional social and structural drivers of the three diseases. These are often at greatest risk. **We must prioritize investments that are dramatically and clearly underfunded and underperforming.**

Catalytic Investments strive to catalyze work in areas that cannot be undertaken by country grants alone but also fund areas where additional investment is needed. While all pledges and contributions are welcome, we note for our Board colleagues, who are utilizing the privilege of being able to ear-mark their investments, that **ear-marking – as opposed to pooling investments – is a chance to specifically prioritize the areas that remain suboptimally funded, as an area of great need and opportunity for rapid impact.**

South East Asia

The figure that should concern this Board is not the 99% utilization rate. It is the Unfunded Quality Demand register. Utilization of country allocations is now almost complete, yet more than US\$5.7 billion of technically recommended investments remain unfunded. That suggests Unfunded Quality Demand is no longer simply a financing gap at the end of a grant cycle. It is becoming a recurring feature of the allocation model itself.

For implementing constituencies such as ours, the implication is clear. Countries continue to develop technically sound, prioritized investments that cannot be funded within available allocations. Savings and efficiencies help, but they are not changing the underlying pattern.

We ask the Secretariat to report to the 56th Board Meeting on how GC7 Unfunded Quality Demand has been prioritized as additional resources became available, including the criteria

used for funding decisions and the distribution of resources across disease programmes and RSSH investments. This will allow the Board to assess whether the current approach is reducing unmet demand or simply managing it from one cycle to the next.

UNAIDS

NA

22.5 Financial Performance Update

Eastern Mediterranean Region

The Q1 2026 report records a US\$13 million loss against a backdrop of 8% pledge conversion and an adverse FX environment. The Board is making binding GC8 decisions on the basis of a nominal pledge that has not been stress-tested. We request that the Secretariat present a downside financial projection — modeled at 80%, 85% and 95% pledge conversion — to the AFC and Strategy Committee before the next relevant GC8 funding and implementation decisions. This is a standard fiduciary governance requirement, not an exceptional ask.

Developed Country NGO

We re-emphasize that while risks remain sizable, our Delegation takes confidence in the Secretariat's approach to forecasting both sources and uses of funds and the continued evolution in financial assurance processes such that country grant allocations remain maximized while risk monitoring and mitigation stays on the ball and aligned with the strategic steer by Board and its standing Committees.

On Slide 4 (at the bottom), we have two additional clarifying questions:

- Are there any concerns that we need to know about the “residual GC6 closure gaps...and materiality for ALM and Financial Statement assurance”?
- What is the reason for the “increased monitoring and oversight of PPM / WAMBO procurement conversion within the AUP slippage allowable within 180 days?”

South East Asia

RSSH investments remain the main area where strong portfolio performance is not yet matched by implementation. GC7 Year 2 in-country absorption for RSSH modules stands at 56%, compared with 83% for non-RSSH modules. The paper attributes part of this gap to planned rebalancing, but it also identifies a further US\$162 million rebalancing opportunity that remains outstanding. This suggests the gap is not fully explained by design choices alone.

From the perspective of the SEA Constituency, RSSH underpins the systems that support HIV, tuberculosis and malaria programmes across all implementing countries. If this gap persists, strong financial performance elsewhere may conceal weaker progress in the systems on which those programmes depend.

We ask the Secretariat to report to the Audit and Finance Committee before the 56th Board Meeting on how much of the RSSH absorption gap is attributable to planned rebalancing and how much reflects implementation bottlenecks, and to confirm the status of the remaining US\$162 million rebalancing opportunity.

We also ask that RSSH remain a separate line item in future financial performance reports to the AFC, so the Committee can track whether the gap relative to non-RSSH investments is narrowing over time.

UNAIDS

NA

22.6 2025 IEP Annual Report

Developed Country NGO

As the Global Fund moves to a new model for evaluation and learning, we note the recommendations from the IEP that remain relevant regardless of function structure: Using a clearer theory of change in evaluation work, cross-fertilizing evaluation and evidence work across issues, and strengthening learning.

South East Asia

The report raises one issue the Board should not overlook: evaluations are being produced and rated for quality, but the Global Fund still has limited evidence that its recommendations lead to operational change. The IEP notes that uptake of recommendations remains highly limited and questions the value of recommendation workshops given that outcome. That is a governance issue, not simply an evaluation issue.

We are the subject of evaluations such as Community Engagement and Community Responses and Systems Strengthening. If recommendations from these evaluations are not tracked to specific changes in policy or grant management, countries carry the burden of being evaluated without knowing whether the findings improve how the Global Fund works.

We have two recommendations.

First, we ask the Evaluation and Learning Office to report to the Strategy Committee, before the next Board meeting, the number and share of accepted recommendations from the Malaria Sub-national Tailoring, Community Engagement and CRSS evaluations that have been implemented or incorporated into Secretariat policy or operational practice, with the corresponding change identified.

Second, we ask the Evaluation and Learning Office and the IEP to agree and publish a single working definition of “learning” before the end of this Board cycle, as the report itself identifies the absence of a shared definition as a weakness.

UNAIDS

NA

22.7 Report of the Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer

Developed Country NGO

We are grateful to see the clear opening reflection from CELO, consistent with all the

evidence we have seen, that “stronger community systems [are] foundational to both improved disease outcomes and critical toward long-term sustainability.” The report reinforces a range of the key points we know to be true about community systems, and the significant gaps that remain – with threats only growing in GC8. As we transition to a new learning and evaluation model, we want to be certain that the learning and action from this existing finding continues. Without further action, the challenge on community systems will continue to persist, and we encourage it to remain a top priority for focus and attention, even if the particular framework for tracking the recommendations may shift.

South East Asia

The SEA Constituency thanks the Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer for a thoughtful synthesis of 2024-2025 evaluations and welcomes its central finding that stronger community systems are foundational to sustainable, equitable health outcomes. We particularly welcome early signals of uptake, including the Community Responses and Systems Strengthening (CRSS) Maturity Framework now being piloted, and the retention of the Community Priorities Annex in GC8 Funding Requests.

We are, however, concerned by the report's finding that community systems for TB and malaria remain considerably less mature than for HIV, with weaker organization, fewer dedicated investments, and KPI frameworks that do not yet capture community contributions to these diseases. This is directly relevant to our region: SEA carries over 45% of the global TB burden, and the majority of global malaria cases are concentrated in India, Indonesia and Myanmar. Without deliberate investment in TB and malaria community systems specifically, GC8's equity and sustainability ambitions risk being unevenly realized across diseases. We also note the persistent data quality and sub-national capacity constraints identified in the Malaria SNT Evaluation, which are highly relevant given the scale of malaria programming in our region.

We encourage the Secretariat to ensure the CRSS Maturity Framework and revised KPI S4 are applied consistently across all three diseases as GC8 rolls out, and to prioritize technical assistance for TB and malaria community systems where capacity gaps are greatest. We look forward to continued collaboration to close this gap.

UNAIDS

NA

22.8 2025 TRP Performance Assessment

Eastern Mediterranean Region

GC8 review criteria for transition readiness, community systems maturity and output-based contracting will determine whether countries in fragile settings receive allocations adequate to maintain essential service continuity. With a TRP leadership transition occurring in Q3 2026, the EMRC requests a formal consultation before the next relevant GC8 funding-request window on how these criteria will be calibrated in COE and fragile contexts, including countries with high external-financing dependence, displaced and mobile populations, weak diagnostic systems and constrained co-financing capacity.

South East Asia

This paper shows the Technical Review Panel taking on a role beyond review. It developed the GC8 sample funding request, contributed to the GC8 application materials, and will pilot pre-shaping engagement for Focused Portfolios in 2026. The same institution is now helping shape what applicants submit and then independently reviewing those submissions. That makes clear governance safeguards more important than before.

For the SEA, this matters because several countries in our region are Focused Portfolios, where pre-shaping engagement will be introduced first. Applicants should be confident that early technical advice does not compromise the independence of the subsequent review.

We are not questioning the TRP's independence. We are asking the Board to see the safeguard, rather than assume it.

We ask the TRP Chair to report to the Strategy Committee, before Window 1 pre-shaping begins, on the mechanism that separates pre-shaping engagement from the later technical review, including how potential conflicts of interest will be identified and managed.

We also ask the Secretariat to confirm, in the same report, how these safeguards will be documented so that they can be verified during the GC8 review process.

UNAIDS

NA

22.9 Recoveries Report

Eastern Mediterranean Region

The US\$47.3 million total recoverable balance is increasing — up US\$2.4 million in a single quarter — and the default resolution mechanism of allocation reduction is being applied in contexts where it compounds program damage rather than remedying the underlying fiduciary failure. The EMRC requests disaggregated EMR recoverable data as a standing governance deliverable, and formal AFC consideration of alternative recovery pathways — extended repayment, debt restructuring — before allocation reduction is applied in COE and fragile portfolios.

South East Asia

The issue in this report is no longer whether recoveries are being pursued. It is how unresolved recoveries are being resolved. The Secretariat is increasingly using allocation reductions when other recovery options have been exhausted. In a constrained financing environment, that protects Global Fund resources, but it can also reduce future programme allocations. The report recognises this trade-off. It is therefore a governance issue, not simply a financial one.

Allocation reductions affect future implementation. Indonesia is one of the countries listed in the report, but the principle applies to all implementing countries. When unresolved recoveries are settled through future allocations, the Board should understand not only how funds are recovered, but also how essential services are protected.

We ask the Secretariat to report to the Audit and Finance Committee before the 56th Board Meeting the criteria used to determine when allocation reductions are applied at a 2:1 rather than a 1:1 ratio, using cases approved since January 2025 to illustrate how those criteria have been applied.

We also ask the Secretariat to report whether allocation reductions approved since January 2025 have affected planned HIV, tuberculosis, malaria, or RSSH activities, and how service continuity risks were assessed before those reductions were implemented.

UNAIDS

22.10 Report of the Ethics Officer

Eastern Mediterranean Region

The EMRC notes that residual ethics risk is rated "high" in part because preventive funding has been reduced — a direct consequence of the OPEX constraint. This is a Board-level governance judgment, not a technical one, and the AFC should assess explicitly whether the current residual ethics risk level sits within the approved Financial and Fiduciary risk appetite. We would appreciate confirmation that the ethics risk appetite statement will be presented to the Board in October 2026.

Developed Country NGO

We appreciate the report from the Ethics Officer. Our Delegation has previously asked how the Ethics Office – in collaboration with Human Resources and the Ombuds – planned to formally measure the level of trust to assess its progress. It references conducting a baseline survey, and we would appreciate knowing about the commitment and potential timing to conduct future surveys in this area.

At this Board meeting, could the Ethics Office provide context on the priority-country CCMs involved in the learning and awareness activities and undertaking targeted conflicts of interest (COI) management capacity assessments?

We highlight again that the report notes that only 195 CCM members (41%) completed the e-learning on the CCM Code of Conduct. **We would appreciate the Secretariat sharing thinking around this, and again ask at this Board meeting, how the Ethics Office could potentially increase the percentage?**

At this Board meeting, could the Secretariat share the 38 Principal Recipients and 23 countries that have been provided targeted technical assistance to build PSEAH capacity?

Communities

The approved Ethics Office budget for 2025 was increased, yet actual spending came in well short of that budget, and PSEAH spending fell even further short, despite its budget being only modestly reduced. We ask whether this reflects deliberate prioritization or an unplanned shortfall, since survivor follow-up support is not consistently guaranteed once a case closes. We also ask that the decline in reported SEAH cases be consistently caveated in all Board reporting as a sign of sector disruption, not improved safety, as the report itself states. Governance capacity shows a similar gap: only 41% of CCM members have completed Code of Conduct training after three years, a real concern given that CCMs are the primary channel through which communities engage with Global Fund governance. Separately, both Speaking Up and Accountability remain one tier below "Managing" under the ECI framework, and retaliation-protection language is inconsistent across policies. These gaps matter most for community and key-population whistleblowers. We ask for firm plans and 2026 dates, not general windows, to close the CCM training gap, finalize escalation SOPs, and harmonize whistleblowing policy language.

This capacity concern is compounded by the move to hybrid/digital and risk-based PSEAH support, which risks disadvantaging lower-connectivity, lower-capacity settings that often carry the highest SEAH risk. We ask how access and the quality of support will be specifically safeguarded for these communities.

Finally, we flag a longstanding structural issue that predates all of this: community and civil society recipients of Global Fund resources are barred from sitting on the CCMs overseeing

those same resources, while government recipients face no equivalent restriction. This undermines the meaningful community representation on which our advocacy depends, and we ask that it be addressed as part of any CCM governance reform alongside GC8.

West and Central Africa

The constituencies note the Ethics Officer's assessment that ethics and integrity risks remain high and are increasing as a result of financial constraints, organisational change, and a more complex operating environment. As the Global Fund places greater reliance on country systems and country ownership, ethics capacity and oversight at country level become increasingly important. *How does the Secretariat intend to operationalise the proposed acceptance of higher residual ethics risk while ensuring that ethics capacity and oversight continue to be strengthened?*

ESA and WCA also welcome the continued integration of the Protection from Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (PSEAH) framework into grant processes and country systems. We also encourage the Global Fund to liaise with national state or non-state institutions active in this area in implementing countries. As survivors are likely to remain in their own countries and not emigrate, it is vital that the survivors be connected to local support if it exists in addition to the support from the Global Fund headquarters. This situation is more vital the ethics officer in the CCM has reduced time due to constraints.

Resource constraints should not weaken prevention, awareness or early risk identification, and we encourage the Secretariat to ensure that technology and automation strengthen rather than diminish the Global Fund's ethics framework.

South East Asia

The report presents two trends that deserve to be considered together. PSEAH spending was 36% below budget in 2025, while SEAH case openings fell 31%. At the same time, the Board is expected to define the ethics risk appetite in 2027. That sequencing matters. By the time the Board sets its risk appetite, many of the operational changes described in this report will already be underway.

For implementing constituencies, however, the shift towards local PSEAH focal points, CCM and online tools means it will be important to understand whether these new approaches are maintaining the same level of prevention, detection and response.

We ask the EGC, before recommending the 2027 ethics risk appetite to the Board, to request that the Secretariat present the evidence used to assess whether the decline in SEAH case openings reflects changes in underlying risk, reporting behaviour or detection capacity, and explain how that assessment has informed the proposed risk appetite.

We also ask the Ethics Office to report at the 56th Board Meeting on whether the CCM Ethics Officer model and other locally delivered approaches are identifying ethics risks as effectively as the previous arrangements.

UNAIDS

The UNAIDS Constituency welcomes the Ethics Officer's Annual Report and continued efforts to strengthen the Global Fund's ethical culture, integrity and accountability.

As the partnership operates in an increasingly complex environment, maintaining the highest standards of ethics, transparency and accountability is essential to sustaining trust among countries, communities, donors and partners. We support continued investment in prevention, awareness, speak-up culture and organizational learning, recognising that strong ethical governance is fundamental to effective programme delivery and partnership.

Point Seven

Point Seven welcomes the conclusion of the Ethics Office's 2025 report, which affirms that the Global Fund has a solid ethics and integrity framework and is responding to identified issues in line with its approved policies and procedures. We reaffirm our zero-tolerance policy on sexual exploitation, abuse, and harassment. Even in the context of constrained resources, this must remain a non-negotiable principle across the Global Fund partnership and throughout all supported programs. We support a risk-based approach that prioritizes action where vulnerabilities are greatest, strengthens prevention and response systems, and ensures that safeguarding is fully integrated into effective, equitable, and accountable program delivery. While we welcome the planned updates to guidance, frameworks, and the Code of Conduct in 2026, the true measure of success will be whether these changes translate into stronger safeguarding outcomes on the ground. It is therefore essential that the Fund not only maintains, but demonstrably increases, its impact in protecting the people it serves.

We acknowledge that the organization continues to operate in a very high-risk environment. We therefore welcome closer collaboration with Risk and OIG to enhance the systematic sharing of root causes, trends, and emerging misconduct issues, supporting a more proactive and efficient approach.

Joint Constituency Statement

European Commission, Belgium, Italy, Portugal, Spain,
France, Germany Point Seven

55th Board Meeting

55th Board Meeting
July 8, 2026

Constituency statements

Pre-Day Session: The Evolving Global Health Ecosystem: Perspectives on Partnership, Country Leadership and Impact

The session aims to:

1. Explore perspectives on the future of global health cooperation and the implications of ongoing changes in the global health ecosystem.
2. Hear directly from countries, communities, regional institutions and global partners on the challenges, opportunities and priorities they see for the years ahead.
3. Foster dialogue on how global, regional and national actors can work together more effectively to support country-led priorities, strengthen resilience and maximize health impact in a constrained resource environment.
4. Identify opportunities to strengthen partnership, complementarity and collective action in support of sustainable and equitable health outcomes.

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Welcome Reception

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Opening of the Board Meeting

Opening Day 1

- Opening remarks & Moment of Reflection (lighting of candle)

For Decision

- Approval of the Agenda (no objection)
- Approval of the Rapporteur (no objection)

European Constituencies wish to reaffirm our strong appreciation and support for the Global Fund's work at this time of significant change and uncertainty in the global health landscape. The Global Fund's partnership model and its results in the fight against HIV, TB and malaria remain more relevant than ever. As the organisation adapts to a shifting operating environment, we encourage the Global Fund to play an active and constructive role in the various ongoing reform processes, the WHO-hosted process and the Accra Reset, to help shape a coherent future global health architecture. In doing so, we underline that the hard-won gains of the past two decades must be preserved and protected throughout any process of reform or transition.

Update by the Executive Director

The Executive Director's (ED) biannual (verbal) update on progress including GC8 early observations and forward-looking priorities.

The update will also include key messages from written updates including, Resource Mobilization, Strategic Performance Report, Country Funding and

Financial Reports in order to provide a holistic evidence-based overview.

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Coffee

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Risk Matters

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Risk Management Report and Annual Opinion

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Adjustments to Risk Appetite Statements

Decision on tier 1 risk appetite statements:

a.) Program, b.) Health Product Access, Affordability and Innovation, c.)
Financial and Fiduciary

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Lunch

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

GC8 (2027 - 2029) Strategy Costing (OPEX)

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Closed Session

Participation from donor and implementer constituencies.

Agenda to be communicated separately.

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Coffee

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Next Gen Market Shaping - Non-Global Fund Financed Procurement

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Annual Procurement and Next Gen Reporting

To provide recent new reporting requirement supporting Board understanding of core area of investment, including focus on linkages to GC8 strategic shifts, sustainability, transition, and innovation.

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Policy on NGFP and establishment of NGFPM

European Constituencies welcome the policy change enabling non-Global Fund procurement through the Global Fund's procurement platform. We see clear potential for this mechanism to expand affordable access to quality-assured health products and to strengthen the Global Fund's value proposition to partners. At the same time, we require robust transparency safeguards.

- Checks and balances: clear-cut guardrails and an operationalization of admissible “limited deviations” from GFATM procurement policy are missing. We therefore propose an amendment for the DP requesting that the Secretariat returns to the SC at its October 2026 meeting with a further articulation of the safeguards to achieve value for money, protect against market distortion and supplier concentration, and support effective oversight and reporting on implementation and associated risks.
- Pre-Financing facility: ensuring that the operational framework sets clear parameters for prioritisation, focusing on countries most in need.
- Supplier and manufacturing geography outcomes: transparency on how non-Global Fund procurement affects supplier base diversification and manufacturing geography, including implications for regional manufacturing ambitions.
- A long-term strategic perspective for the platform should be linked with the broader ongoing architecture reform discussions, ensuring that it supports and complements regional and country-level procurement platforms as these evolve. We ask the Secretariat to work towards clear interoperability benchmarks with regional and country-level procurement platforms.
- African manufacturing: we strongly ask that the platform's growth be accompanied by a clear ambition to progressively increase the share of African manufacturers in the overall volume of transactions, in line with the Global Fund's broader commitment to supporting regional manufacturing capacity and supply diversification. We ask the Secretariat to work towards a clear time-bound trajectory and to further reflect on a potential regional manufacturing target.

Report of the Ethics Officer

Provision of opinion to Board on ethics landscape, risks and overall maturity of the ethics program.

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Closed session

Participation from donor and implementer constituencies.
Agenda to be communicated separately.

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Coffee

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Executive Director Nomination Committee Progress Update

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Governance Effectiveness

Opportunity for Board discussion on governance effectiveness in support of impact in a complex and resource-constrained context.

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Lunch

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

2025 OIG Annual Report

Provision of opinion to Board from OIG on risk management, governance and internal controls
Annual Report and Annual Opinion on Governance, Risk Management and Internal Controls.
Update on Agreed Management Actions

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Approach to Evidence and Learning

Based on SC input, the Secretariat will seek Board input on a proposed approach to evidence and learning.

We endorse the objectives of efficiency and agility in the future evaluation model. However, independence must remain the central pillar guiding this reform, not a secondary consideration.

- Structural guarantee of independent challenge: with the proposal to essentially dissolve the Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP), we ask what guarantee of independent challenge will remain within the new model. We oppose giving up independent advice and quality oversight also in light of reputational risks.
 - Independent impact and outcome evaluation: given that the OIG is Charter-barred from impact evaluation, we ask how independent impact and outcome evaluation will be assured going forward. OIG system-level assurance is necessary but is not a substitute for evaluating whether programs actually work.
 - Transparent trigger mechanism: we request a clear, transparent mechanism defining when and how the Decision Pathway for independent external evaluation is triggered, so that this function cannot simply wither over time.
 - Ring-fenced funding floor: a ring-fenced, multi-year funding floor for independent external evaluation work, including the overseeing of the evaluations, protecting it from being squeezed out in leaner budget years.
 - Right to commission: an explicit right for the Strategy Committee and the Board — not only the Secretariat — to commission independent evaluations, with the Strategy Committee's named priority areas (including GC8 shifts, transition and blended finance) serving as a useful starting list.
- Evaluating the new evaluation model: we note that the Secretariat proposes that the OIG audit the new model after 18-24 months and strongly suggest that this evaluation is externalized given the central role and direct involvement of the OIG in this proposal.

Coffee

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Global Health Ecosystem including Global Fund-Gavi Collaboration Update

For Board discussion following the Board retreat and the Joint GF-Gavi Technical Briefing.

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Closing

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Written Updates

These items are only shared in writing ahead of the meeting. No discussion time is planned. This time slot is purely for administrative purposes to reflect these written updates on the agenda.

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Update on Resource Mobilization and the 8th Replenishment

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Strategic Performance Report

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Report of the Coordinating Group & the Board Leadership

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Country Funding Update

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Financial Performance Update

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

2025 IEP Annual Report

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Report of the Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

2025 TRP Performance Assessment

Use this zone to fill up the required information.

Recoveries Report

Use this zone to fill up the required information.