

Full report:

**Joint Africa Constituency Meeting
Strengthening Representation for Africa in Global
Fund Governance**

Johannesburg, South Africa, 9-11 July 2012

Report prepared by Jeff Hoover

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction and Overview	5
2. Statement of Need: Current Representation Structure and Limitations.....	6
2.1 Defining ‘constituency representatives’	6
2.2 Limitations of current approach.....	6
2.3 Reasons for the limitations.....	7
3. Main Discussion Topics	8
3.1 Composition of Africa constituencies	8
3.2 Selection of constituency representatives	10
3.3 Tenure of Board representatives	11
3.4 Improving communications	12
3.5 Establishing a central resource and communications office	13
4. Consensus Points.....	15
5. Timeline and Next Steps	17
Annex 1. Africa Input in ‘Better Grants for Increased Impact’ Project	18

Acronyms and abbreviations

ABM =	Alternate Board Member
AU =	African Union
CFP =	Communications Focal Point
EoI =	Expression of interest
ESA =	East and Southern Africa
Global Fund =	Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria
ToR =	Term of reference
WCA =	West and Central Africa

July 11, 2012

Executive Summary

The Vice Chair of the Global Fund Board, the Honourable Dr. Mphu Ramatlapeng, former Minister of Health of Lesotho, convened a consultative meeting of the two African delegations to the Board on 9-11 July 2012 in Johannesburg, South Africa. Of the 78 total participants, some 60 high-level individuals attended from 30 African countries, including Ministers of Health from five nations. An Ad Hoc Working Group coordinated by the Vice Chair organized the consultation and oversaw the overall process, including the development of concept papers and proposals for change.

The overall goal of the meeting was to identify ways—and achieve consensus on steps to be taken—to improve the quality and impact of Africa’s representation on the Global Fund Board and key committees. Achieving that goal is considered necessary to increase the continent’s influence on Global Fund decision making and help ensure that a more united and stronger “voice” of Africa is heard and recognized. The meeting provided an opportunity for representatives from countries in the two Global Fund Africa constituencies, East and Southern Africa (ESA) and West and Central Africa (WCA), to better understand the current barriers to effective Board and committee representation and to develop solutions to overcome them.

Numerous limitations with the current capacity and effectiveness of African representation were presented at the consultation. Most notable is the observation that African representatives have played minimal roles in influencing discussion and decisions taken at Board meetings. Board Members from ESA and WCA sometimes fail to attend meetings altogether; when they do attend, they often appear to be poorly prepared and thus unable to contribute meaningfully. The contrast with other delegations is often quite striking, as their representatives generally have clear, informed positions based on input received from across their constituencies. Due to inadequate attention to the communications aspect of representation, African representatives usually have not solicited such input or have done so in an unsystematic and incomplete way. As a result, they are not truly playing the representation role expected of them. The consequences include limited African influence on critical strategic decisions related to the Global Fund in general, and to those of vital importance to Africa in particular.

Broadly speaking, the limitations relate to three main areas: process, substance and structure. Process refers to how representatives should be selected, supported and monitored. Substance refers to the quality of the representation, including in regard to i) impact on Board decision making, and ii) communications, information-sharing and consultation throughout the constituency. Structure refers to how constituencies are organized as well as the availability of and access to technical support and resources to improve representation.

All participants were in agreement that the constituencies are currently not represented well and thus changes are needed—and should be instituted as quickly as possible. Discussions therefore were extensive and intense at times as attendees sought consensus on a range of options for new and improved structures, systems and processes.

By the end of the meeting, participants had reached agreement on a substantial list of consensus points as well as how they would like implementation to proceed, at least in the short-term. The following are among the key decisions taken, each of which is reflected in the consensus document agreed on at the conclusion of the consultation:

- All constituency representative selection decisions should be open and transparent, and based on competency and capacity. Explicit criteria and performance indicators should be created for all

July 11, 2012

constituency representatives and outlined in ToRs; these criteria should specify preferred qualifications as well as expected time needed to adequately fulfil responsibilities.

- The selection process for Board Members should no longer be based on rotation in alphabetical order of countries. Instead, it should include a screening panel that would review candidates submitted by countries and approved by governments, and create a short-list based on objective evaluation of qualifications as per ToRs. Constituencies would then vote for preferred candidates from those on the short-list.
- A manual of standard operating procedures (SOPs) should be developed to provide guidance on all constituency operations and systems. The SOPs will define selection processes in detail, including in regards to rotation among delegation members. They will also define evaluation processes and steps that can be taken to address weak performance.
- Improving the capacity and awareness of incoming Board Members is critical. To promote continuity and skills-sharing, participants agreed that the selection of new representatives must be completed by three months prior to the end of the predecessors' terms. The outgoing and new representatives would be required to engage regularly during that three-month period to transfer knowledge, information and recommendations.
- Constituency consultations should be held prior to each Global Fund Board and Committee meeting. These consultations, which could be done in-person or through teleconference, will discuss and determine constituency positions on issues to be discussed at the meetings.
- To provide effective Global Fund-related technical and communications services to the constituencies, a dedicated coordinating office should be established. This "Bureau" would serve both constituencies. It could comprise a small number of full-time staff, including the Communications Focal Persons selected by each African delegation, who offer a range of technical skills, including communications (collecting and processing); analysis (preparing position papers for Board members and reviewing grant portfolios, etc.); advocacy (making constituency positions known); lobbying (building political alliances); negotiations (detailing Africa positions and brokering compromise, etc.); and multilingual competency (to ensure timely and accurate communications throughout constituencies). Determination of where such a Bureau is located, and which organization hosts it, would be based on responses to calls for expressions of interest (EoIs) developed and distributed widely after ToRs and budgets are drafted.

One proposed change that did not move forward deserves mention. Participants considered different options for organizing the two Africa seats on the Board. In the end, the majority supported retaining the current division based on geography (ESA and WCA). Rejected were those organizing delegations by language (one seat for English-speaking nations and the other for French-, Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking countries), and by disease burden (one seat for "high impact" nations only, as per Global Fund classification). A fourth proposed option, to organize seats by economic blocs—i.e., the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), the East African Community (EAC), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC)—generated some support. Many participants said they hope to integrate their delegations' Global Fund work more closely with such economic groups at some point in the future.

The constituencies instructed the Ad Hoc Working Group to undertake initial implementation of the agreed-upon changes on its behalf until further notice.

July 11, 2012

1. Introduction and Overview

The Vice Chair of the Global Fund Board, the Honourable Dr. Mphu Ramatlapeng, former Minister of Health of Lesotho, convened a consultative meeting of the two African delegations to the Board on 9-11 July 2012 in Johannesburg, South Africa. Of the 78 total participants, some 60 high-level individuals attended from 30 African countries, including Ministers of Health from five nations. They were joined by representatives from the Global Fund Secretariat; multilateral entities (including WHO and UNAIDS); and other key stakeholders in African health and development processes, including the civil society sector. (A list of all participants will be made available on Global Fund website.)

Africa currently receives 60 percent of Global Fund resources yet is relatively marginalized in Global Fund governance structures. The overall goal of the meeting was to identify ways—and achieve consensus on steps to be taken—to improve the quality and impact of Africa’s representation on the Global Fund Board and key committees. Achieving that goal is considered necessary to increase the continent’s influence on Global Fund decision making and help ensure that a more united and stronger “voice” of Africa is heard and recognized.

The meeting provided an opportunity for representatives from countries in the two Global Fund Africa constituencies, East and Southern Africa (ESA) and West and Central Africa (WCA), to better understand the current barriers to effective Board and committee representation and to develop solutions to overcome them. The consultation and its outcomes are an important element of a larger Global Fund governance reform process currently under way, which itself is essential to realize the Global Fund Strategy 2012-2016: Investing for Impact.

Although the Secretariat provided technical support, the consultation was organized and coordinated independently of the Global Fund. The independence and separation are intentional because Global Fund bylaws specify that constituencies have sole responsibility for deciding how to structure their Board and committee representation processes and procedures. The only constraints are the following, for the time being: i) the number of Board seats currently reserved for Africa (two of the 10 implementer seats) will remain unchanged, and ii) ten delegates is the ceiling on the overall size of each constituency’s delegation to Global Fund meetings.

In March 2012, the Vice Chair coordinated the formation of an Ad Hoc Working Group to organize the consultation and oversee the overall process of Board governance reform. Members of that Working Group spent several months preparing concept papers and other documentation that were distributed to participants in advance of the meeting. During the consultation itself, members of the Working Group also delivered presentations providing additional background information about Global Fund governance structures; examples of good representation; and potential options to address the currently unsatisfactory representation quality. Participants discussed and debated various options and priorities in plenary sessions and small working groups. (The full text of all presentations will be made available on the Global Fund website.)

Participants succeeded in reaching consensus on a number of points by the end of the consultation. This report, which summarizes discussions leading to the consensus decisions, is structured as follows:

- Section 2: Purpose for the consultation, including limitations and shortcomings of the current Africa representation structure and processes
- Section 3: Main areas of discussion
- Section 4: List of agreed consensus points

July 11, 2012

- Section 5: Timeline and next steps for implementing consensus points

Annex 1 at the end of the publication refers to an ancillary part of the consultation to solicit input on a Global Fund reform project (“Better Grants for Increased Impact”).

2. Statement of Need: Current Representation Structure and Limitations

2.1 Defining ‘constituency representatives’

As are all constituencies within the Global Fund governance structure, both Africa delegations are represented by one Board Member and one Alternate Board Member (ABM). Their key functions and roles include consulting regularly with the constituency on issues related to the Global Fund Board, including in regards to all Board decisions. Each delegation also has a Communications Focal Point (CFP), who is expected to develop and maintain an extensive network of contacts and communicate on a regular basis with national focal points in each country. All three of these individuals are funded by the Global Fund to attend Board meetings. Attendance of additional delegates who are members of Board committees is also funded (one person from each delegation). Each delegation is also permitted to bring six additional people to Board meetings. For the African delegations, their participation is financed from the delegation budget of US\$80,000 per year available from the Global Fund for constituency activities.

The term “constituency representatives” refers to the 10 individuals on the Board delegation as well as those serving on the three main Global Fund committees: the Strategy, Investment and Impact Committee (SIIC), the Finance and Operational Performance Committee (FOPC) and the Audit and Ethics Committee (AEC). Committee Members are expected to seek input from their constituency on issues being considered prior to committee meetings.

Both the ESA and WCA delegations select Board Members and ABMs to serve for two-year terms. Members are currently chosen on a rotation basis as per alphabetical order of countries. This process is unique to the African delegations. By custom—though not required, as constituencies can create whatever selection process suits them—Board Members from ESA and WCA choose their CFP from among staff or experts from their own countries to serve during their terms. This CFP selection system is similar to that of some other implementing delegations. Donor delegations have a different system, however: most appoint “permanent” CFPs in an effort to sustain institutional memory and increase effectiveness.

2.2 Limitations of current approach

In prepared remarks and presentations, the Vice Chair and members of the Ad Hoc Working Group identified numerous limitations with the current quality and effectiveness of African representation. Their observations and findings are summarized below.

African representatives have played minimal roles in influencing discussion and decisions taken at Board meetings. Board Members and ABMs from ESA and WCA sometimes fail to attend meetings altogether; when they do attend, they often appear to be poorly prepared and thus unable to contribute meaningfully. The contrast with other delegations is often quite striking, as their representatives generally have clear, informed positions based on input received from across their constituencies. African representatives

July 11, 2012

usually have not solicited such input or have done so in an unsystematic and incomplete way. As a result, they are not truly playing the comprehensive representation role expected of them.

The consequences include limited African influence on critical strategic decisions related to the Global Fund in general, and to those of vital importance to Africa in particular. For example, in 2010 the Secretariat recommended that Zambia's request for Phase 2 funding for a Round 7 TB grant be rejected for a number of reasons. The ESA representatives did not explain the issue across the constituency or engage beyond a basic level; in the end, the ESA Board Member did not even vote when the recommendation was presented to the Board and approved. Observation and evidence indicate that African representatives were largely silent during Board discussions and decisions over the past year regarding the following: i) the cancellation of Round 11; ii) the implementation of and subsequent retreat from imposing the controversial "55 percent rule"¹; iii) the adoption of the 2012-2016 Strategy; and iv) the decision to hire a General Manager to replace the Executive Director. Neither ESA nor WCA representatives expressed opinions or provided useful input in regards to a selection process, also agreed in May 2012, to find a new Executive Director.

Taken together, these representation lapses indicate a worrisome lack of engagement and influence as well as deficient accountability. Constituency members at country level are often unaware of the gaps because they rarely if ever are consulted by their Board representatives or CFPs prior to or after meetings. Some consultation participants acknowledged that they were not even aware that they were part of a "constituency", even though they have received and implemented Global Fund grants regularly. The breakdown in communications thus further limits the ability of African voices and needs to be heard.

2.3 Reasons for the limitations

Numerous reasons for the poor quality of representation were cited during presentations and plenary discussion. Among them were the following:

- Decisions about representation are not based on competency and capacity. No explicit selection criteria and process exist beyond rotation in alphabetical order of countries. Also, Ministers of Health usually serve as Board Members from the two Africa constituencies, even if they have little awareness of the Global Fund and/or insufficient time to devote to the role's responsibilities. To be effective, representatives should dedicate around 25 percent of their time to Global Fund work, according to consultation participants familiar with the responsibilities. Ministers are rarely able to allocate such extensive time.
- The selection of CFPs fails to take into account the experience and competencies needed to successfully fill the role. The trend in the African constituencies has been for Board Members to appoint personal assistants and other staff to serve as CFPs. Such decisions reflect a limited understanding of the full range of responsibilities, language competencies, and the time needed to undertake them effectively. CFPs should have a strong background in communications as well as

¹ That rule, agreed to at the November 2011 Board meeting, mandates that 55 percent of funding must go to low-income countries. The rule benefits most (though not all) countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Strong opposition from representatives of other delegations prompted the Board to decide, at its May 2012 Board meeting, to defer the rule's implementation while it considered the issue more extensively. That decision was considered a setback for most countries in Africa, especially given the restrictive Global Fund financial situation. Yet African representatives on the Board reportedly failed to articulate concerns, with one apparently not voting at all on the proposal to freeze the rule's implementation.

July 11, 2012

the adequate time and resources to fulfil their responsibility to organize and maintain regular links throughout the constituency.

- Constituency representatives often fail to recognize that they are expected to represent the constituency as a whole, not just their national interests.
- Linguistic barriers limit effective representation and communications. Many documents are prepared exclusively in English, the working language of the Global Fund. Constituency representatives often fail to arrange for adequate or timely translation into other languages, notably French, Portuguese and Spanish, thereby constraining the ability of many country level representatives to engage even at a basic level. Language differences also inhibit consistent and effective communications to and from countries whose primary language is not used or understood by CFPs and Board Members.
- Africa constituency representatives do not have comprehensive terms of reference (ToRs) that clearly define their responsibilities and thus promote transparency and accountability.

3. Main Discussion Topics

Participants agreed that the obstacles noted in Section 2 are complicated but certainly not insurmountable. Moreover, all were in agreement that the constituencies are currently not represented well and thus changes are needed—and should be instituted as quickly as possible. Discussions therefore were extensive and intense at times as attendees sought consensus on a range of options for new and improved structures, systems and processes.

Broadly speaking, the limitations relate to three main areas: process, substance and structure. Process refers to how representatives should be selected, supported and monitored. Substance refers to the quality of the representation, including in regard to i) impact on Board decision making, and ii) communications, information-sharing and consultation throughout the constituency. Structure refers to how constituencies are organized as well as the availability of and access to technical support and resources to improve representation.

The crux of the consultation centred on consideration of proposals aimed at addressing the limitations directly. The proposals were developed by Ad Hoc Working Group members and presented to participants throughout the course of the consultation. They reviewed in detail during working group discussions that were followed by report-backs and plenary discussion.

The main discussion areas are summarized below. In each case, proposals (including associated options) are presented followed by a summary of notable areas of discussion. Decision points are listed, including whether consensus was achieved. (**Section 4 contains the final list of agreed consensus points for the entire consultation.**)

3.1 Composition of Africa constituencies

Proposed options

July 11, 2012

1. Retain status quo: two delegations organized according to original Global Fund clusters and based on geography. ESA includes 22 countries, with 19 in WCA.
2. Organize by language: one delegation comprising English-speaking countries (20 in total), with 21 French-, Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking countries in the other delegation.
3. Organize by disease burden: one delegation consisting of “high impact” countries as classified by the Global Fund (13 total), with all others in the second delegation
4. Organize by economic blocs: the two delegations would be grouped as per membership in one or more of the main economic blocs in Africa, potentially including the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), the East African Community (EAC), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC)

Notable areas of discussion

Participants showed little interest in dividing by language or disease burden. The main concern regarding the disease burden option was that one of the delegations would be too large, with 32 countries, to be effective and thus would not represent an improvement.

Support was split between the two other options. Those in favour of retaining the status quo stressed that the main problem with the current situation is not how the delegations are organized but lack of adequate engagement, resources and support mechanisms. They emphasized the need to build strong structures and systems to support Board Members and improve communications, including perhaps by adding substructures by language or region—associated, if relevant, with existing economic blocs. Several added that grouping by economic bloc has its own set of challenges, including the fact that some regional bodies are weaker than others and may not have health desks covering the three priority diseases. Others added that organizing by blocs would be difficult because the number of proposed blocs is greater than the number of delegations; moreover, some countries belong to two or more of the groups while a few belong to none.

Participants supporting the fourth option argued that change is needed because the status quo is not working. Most noted that the blocs are well-resourced and already have permanent structures, including communications hubs, which would be useful for Global Fund representatives. They added that economic blocs already discuss and prioritize the three diseases and often have specific programmes addressing them. Two have already served as Global Fund Principal Recipients (ECOWAS and SADC), which gives them experience but may also constitute a conflict of interest with delegation support.

Decisions

Participants did not reach consensus beyond the desire not to split constituencies by language or disease burden. **No change from the status quo in the organization of the constituencies will therefore be recommended at the current time.**

They did agree to take forward an effort to reintegrate Mali into the WCA region (currently it is located in the MENA region). The modalities for such a change were requested from the representatives of the Global Fund Secretariat at the consultation.

And finally, all participants expressed support for advocating for at least one additional Board seat to be allocated to Africa. They wanted this preference to be noted, though it was understood that the Global Fund Board currently has no plans for increasing its size or changing its composition.

July 11, 2012

3.2 Selection of constituency representatives

Participants were presented with several options regarding the selection of constituency representatives. They were asked to consider whether they want to change existing processes—and if yes, how and over what time period.

Proposed for selection of Board Members and ABMs

- Constituency issues a call for Expression of Interest (EoI) for representation on the Board to the constituency member countries
- Countries (CCMs or governments) nominate one candidate to be considered for Board Member or ABM positions
- The short-list and CVs are circulated to all constituency member countries for voting either in a meeting or electronically

Proposed for selection of Committee Members

- Create an inventory of potential experts for Global Fund standing committees
- When a vacancy in a committee arises, a call for candidates will be circulated to all constituency members and those on inventory by the CFP
- A summary of candidates is circulated throughout the constituency for voting, with the recipient of the most votes taking the position
- Board Member and ABM to be tie-breakers

Proposed for selection of Board delegation

- Board Member calls for EoI for constituency member countries to send a Board delegate, taking into consideration the likely topics on the Board agenda. Responses to include information about self-funding of travel and participation costs.
- Selection to be done by Board Member/ABM and CFP. Consideration will be given to continuity while promoting rotation.
- Priority to be given to those directly involved in Global Fund processes at country level
- A summary of candidates and those recommended for delegation membership is circulated to the constituency for notification.

Notable areas of discussion

Participants unanimously agreed that all constituency representative selection decisions should be open and transparent, and based on competency and capacity. Explicit criteria and performance indicators should be created for all constituency representatives and outlined in ToRs; these criteria should specify preferred qualifications as well as expected time needed to adequately fulfil responsibilities.

They also agreed that technical expertise should be taken into account when selecting delegation members to attend each Board meeting. The type and scope of expertise needed should be apparent upon receipt and review of Board agendas and other information circulated in advance that indicate which issues will be discussed. The expertise priority was highlighted in another overarching agreement regarding constituency representatives: the need for technical assistance to build and maintain the capacity of constituencies in all Global Fund governance processes. Dedicated funding for such assistance would need to be secured. The resources could also be used to organize regional consultations for feedback as part of an effort to improve accountability.

July 11, 2012

There were differences of opinion regarding selection processes, however, especially for Board Members. Some participants supported the proposed option (based largely on EoIs); others backed a screening process managed by an ad hoc committee; and still others thought economic blocs should oversee selection. Attendees had different preferences as to who or what should nominate candidates, with some specifying governments while others proposed CCMs. Also, some participants wanted to eliminate any semblance of rotational process for all constituency representatives. Others wanted to retain some element of rotation, at least in regards to delegation selection, to help ensure direct participation by all countries over time. They agreed, however, on the need for performance tracking—including potential recall if found lacking—regardless of selection process.

Decisions

Following extensive discussion, consensus was achieved in regards to the use of a screening panel that would review candidates submitted by countries and create a short-list based on objective evaluation of qualifications as per ToRs. Constituencies would then vote for preferred candidates from those on the short-list. The issue of source of nomination was largely resolved by agreement that candidates need not be civil servants or political appointees, but must be government-supported at least.

A manual of standard operating procedures (SOPs) should be developed to provide guidance on all constituency operations and systems. The SOPs will define selection processes in detail, including in regards to rotation among delegation members. They will also define evaluation processes and steps that can be taken to address weak performance.

3.3 Tenure of Board representatives

Proposed

In an effort to increase representation capacity, the ABM position should be seen in part as a capacity building opportunity. The ABM would therefore serve one year before stepping into the role of the Board Member for the following year, creating a rolling rotation process. The selection process for Board representatives would therefore be undertaken every year for a new ABM only.

Notable areas of discussion

Participants discussed in great deal the ideal tenure of constituency representatives. All recognized the importance of increasing competency and capacity, but they disagreed in regards to length of tenure for representatives and whether terms should be linked or overlapping. The discussions were particularly extensive in regards to the Board Member and ABM, given their direct engagement at the highest level of Global Fund governance processes.

Three possible systems were considered: i) the rotation system proposed above, in which the ABM automatically replaces the Board Member every year; ii) the Board Member and ABM have their own mandates, but are elected in off years so there is always overlap; and iii) the Board Member and ABM have their own mandates but are seen as a “team” with the same tenure, and thus selection for both occurs every two years.

Some participants preferred the first or second option based on a belief they would increase institutional memory and thus bolster continuity and effectiveness. The majority, though, argued that it is important to consider the two representatives as a team in order to ensure they work together more efficiently and

July 11, 2012

without any sense of competition. Regardless of tenure preference, most participants also stressed the importance of regional variation in overall representation. They also wanted reassurance on the ability to evaluate representatives' performance, especially that of ABMs if they had the opportunity of moving up to a full Board Member position.

Decisions

Participants reached consensus that the Board Member and ABM would be elected at the same time, and that each would have a two-year mandate. To promote continuity and skills-sharing, they agreed that the selection of new representatives must be completed by three months prior to the end of the predecessors' terms. The outgoing and new representatives would be required to engage regularly during that three-month period to transfer knowledge, information and recommendations. ABMs would have the right to apply for the full Board Member position at the conclusion of their own term or at any other time in the future.

Participants also agreed that Board Members and ABMs should be from different sub-regions. In the ESA constituency this would mean one would be from East Africa and the other from Southern Africa; in WCA, one would be from West Africa and the other from Central Africa. Constituencies will decide among themselves how to group their countries within those specific sub-regions.

3.4 Improving communications

Discussions around improving communications focused on improving the performance of the constituency's CFPs as well as larger structural issues. Participants agreed that the effectiveness of even the best prepared and knowledgeable CFP would be limited by current communications challenges across such varied constituencies. They therefore sought to identify ways to provide CFPs with adequate support and resources.

Proposed

- Establish ToR for CFPs with specific criteria, including expectations of experience and linguistic competency
- CFP selection should be made by an independent selection panel under an open and transparent process
- CFPs should be accountable to and selected by constituencies (not by Board members). Similarly, CFPs' location need not be linked with Board Members' location, provided that they can communicate easily by telephone, email and other means.
- CFP tenure need not be linked to that of Board Members, especially if the goal is to build and sustain institutional memory.
- Consider the creation of a CFP "team" that would coordinate and centralize communications expertise and capacity across both constituencies.

Notable areas of discussion

Participants agreed that the selection of CFPs should be similar to that of other constituency representatives in regards to being based on qualifications and ToRs (see Section 3.2). Most also agreed that overall communications would be enhanced by creating support structures to coordinate and distribute relevant documentation and information on a timely basis across the constituency. Such efforts

July 11, 2012

would require soliciting input to guide Board Members so they are sufficiently prepared and briefed in advance, and thus clearly represent constituencies.

Decisions

Each country will identify a Country Focal Point who will serve as the main liaison with the constituency CFP. Selection of the CFP from a country's CCM Secretariat was a popular option. The Country Focal Point will oversee broad sharing of information within the country and also be responsible for sending feedback to the constituency CFP and other constituency representatives as needed.

Constituency consultations should be held prior to each Global Fund Board and Committee meeting. These consultations, which could be done in-person or through teleconference, will discuss and determine constituency positions on issues to be discussed at the meetings. If necessary, support for this essential communications priority will be included in overall constituency resource-mobilization efforts.

3.5 Establishing a central resource and communications office

Proposal

To provide effective Global Fund-related technical and communications services to the constituencies, a dedicated coordinating office could be established. This "Bureau" could comprise a small number of full-time staff who offer a range of technical skills, including communications (collecting and processing); analysis (preparing position papers for Board members and reviewing grant portfolios, etc.); advocacy (making constituency positions known); lobbying (building political alliances); negotiations (detailing Africa positions and brokering compromise, etc.); and multilingual competency (to ensure timely and accurate communications throughout constituencies). A Bureau could be hosted by an established political or economic bloc such as the African Union (AU).

Each constituency would appoint an experienced, technically capable CFP to be co-located in the Bureau. Coordination of this sort would help boost collaboration across Africa constituencies and increase the continent's influence at the Global Fund Board.

Notable areas of discussion

The Bureau concept was supported by all participants. They disagreed, however, on whether one pan-African shared structure should be created or separate ones for each of the two constituencies. The rich and lengthy discussion elicited strong opinions based on differing assumptions regarding collaboration, efficiency and impact.

The following reasons were among those cited by supporters of one Bureau:

- A single Bureau is central to achieving a key goal of the consultation: one strong and influential voice for all of Africa. Greater collaboration and the development of common positions are essential to articulate and promote a shared vision for the continent. One participant observed that Africa currently has two voting seats on the World Bank Board and that the lack of coordination means that the members sometimes take opposite positions and cancel each other out. The likelihood of such counterproductive actions at the Global Fund Board in the future would be reduced by increased collaboration through one Bureau uniting the two delegations.

July 11, 2012

- Africa is resource-constrained. Decisions made in such environments should be rationale and useful. Pooling resources and capacity into one Bureau would be cost-effective and create a strong central repository of information and support.
- It is important to be realistic about the time-related limitations across Africa constituencies and what can be done to overcome them. The bottlenecks associated with time, including the expectation that representatives allocate 25 percent of their time to Global Fund affairs, will not be easy to address. One Bureau could help ease the burden on the Board Member and ABM for each delegation.

Arguments presented by supporters of two separate Bureaux included the following:

- Smaller is more effective. A Bureau's role is not only to empower Board representation but to provide services and information to and from all constituency countries. One Bureau cannot effectively serve 41 countries.
- Africa is already divided into two constituencies and we are not proposing to combine them into one. Therefore, why would it make sense to have one Bureau serving separate constituencies?
- Two Bureaux would be stronger and more influential because there would be two voices and resource centres rather than one. Synergies are important, but they can be created through linkages of two strong Bureaux focused primarily on their own constituencies
- Communications and travel across Africa have been and will likely remain difficult; this is one of the reasons the current representation has been weak. It is hard to believe that one Bureau could overcome these challenges, and it seems unlikely that being hosted by a pan-African entity such as the AU would make much of a difference. Two or more Bureaux would be more realistic and effective.

Participants also considered possibilities for where a Bureau (or Bureaux) might be located.

Representatives from three potential organizational hosts provided brief overviews highlighting their assets:

- The East, Central and Southern African Health Community (ECSA HC) is a regional inter-governmental organization that fosters and promotes regional cooperation in health among member states (currently 14). It has flexibility to provide office space and technical and other support. Global Fund-related activities would logically fit within its HIV and AIDS and Infectious Diseases Programme.
- The AU has had a unit in place focusing on the three Global Fund diseases for a decade. It has extensive resources and regularly hosts meeting of high-level decision makers including heads of state and Ministers of Health. Its developed (and multilingual) communications platform is ideally suited to the needs of a pan-African Bureau.
- SADC could provide office space and all relevant facilities at its headquarters in Gaborone, Botswana. It has substantial institutional knowledge of the Global Fund as it has served as a Principal Recipient for a regional grant.

Decisions

The session chair brokered a compromise that led to consensus. The majority position—the establishment of one pan-African Bureau to serve both constituencies—would be taken forward. Its effectiveness and impact would, however, be evaluated after two years. The assessment would consider whether the arrangement adequately met the needs of the two constituencies; if deemed lacking, the decision made to create one entity could be revisited. SOPs for the Bureau would specifically mandate this evaluation.

July 11, 2012

Participants also agreed to implement a transparent and inclusive system to determine where the Bureau would be located and which group might host it. EoIs will be developed and distributed widely after ToRs and budgets have been drafted. Such documentation will help constituencies make informed choices among interested respondents.

4. Consensus Points

Listed below is the full text of the consensus points agreed to by participants at the end of the consultation on 11 July 2012.

To increase their representative capacity in decision-making at the Global Fund Board and its Committees, the WCA and ESA constituencies agree to give effect to the following principles of reform:

1. Appointment of, and representation by, Board Members, Alternate Members and Committee and Delegation Members ('Constituency Representatives')

1.1 Competency based selection: To ensure effective constituency representation:

- a. The alphabetical rotation process used to select Constituency Representatives will no longer be used.
- b. Terms of Reference (ToRs) will be developed for each Constituency Representative role, which set out minimum requirements based on technical competence, experience, and time availability.
- c. The process to fill a Constituency Representative role will involve a transparent call for nomination of country candidates from each country member (government or CCM) within the Constituency based on the agreed ToRs, a screening panel to define a short-list, and a final vote by the constituency members on the short-listed candidates.
- d. The selection process of Constituency Representatives will be defined as part of the Standard Operating Procedures in the constituencies' Manual of Procedures.

1.2 Tenure and representation. Recognizing the diversity of experiences within multi-country constituencies, it is agreed that:

- a. Each 'Constituency Representative' role should have a time-limited mandate; the replacement of members will be based on the competency principles set out in item 1.1 above.
- b. The terms of the Member and Alternate shall be for a coinciding two-year period. They will work together as a team.
- c. The selection process will be conducted to allow for a transitional overlap and handover period of no less than three months between the outgoing Member and Alternate and the incoming Member and Alternate.
- d. The Member and Alternate shall be selected so that both sub-regions of each constituency are represented (West Africa and Central Africa for WCA, East Africa and Southern Africa for ESA).
- e. The Alternate may be proposed as candidate for the Member position providing that his/her performance as Alternate was acceptable.
- f. Committee Members will serve 2-year terms, and there will be a waiting period of two years before they can be proposed again as a Committee Member.

1.3 Performance evaluation:

July 11, 2012

- a. Recognizing the essential need for effective representation, the ToRs for each Constituency Representative Role will include performance indicators.
- b. The Standard Operating Procedures of the Constituencies will set out the evaluation process and the actions that can be taken in the case of weak performance. The frequency of evaluation for each role will be defined therein. There will be SOPs for registering complaints, moving to a vote of No Confidence, recall, and resignation.

2. Developing Constituency Positions

2.1 Pre-meeting consultation:

- a. Constituency positions will be developed by broad consultation prior to each Board and Committee Meeting.
- b. Whenever possible, this will involve an in-person meeting, and could involve joint Constituency meetings to discuss areas of common ground.

3. Effective Constituency Operations

3.1 A manual of standard operating procedures will be developed for the constituency. This will provide guidance on items such as the purpose, functions, and major activities of the constituencies, the terms of reference and accountability process of the Constituency Representatives and support persons, and the methods of implementation of the procedures.

3.2 Internal communications: Each Country will identify a Country Focal Point. The Country Focal Point will ensure broad sharing of information within the Country and transmission of feedback to the Constituency Representatives. The Country Focal Person will liaise with the Constituency Focal Point to ensure more active and inclusive participation.

3.3 Establishment of a bureau: To provide effective technical and communications services to the constituencies, a single Bureau will be established. Each constituency will appoint an experienced, technically capable Constituency Focal Point who will be located at the Bureau: the two will work in unison. Additional staff resources may be required, based on capacity needs assessments. The contribution of the Bureau to the performance of the Constituencies will be evaluated after two years of activity. The major tasks of the Bureau will be:

- a. Regular communication within and between the constituencies;
- b. Ensuring effective document management and access by constituencies;
- c. Analysis and development of constituency positions in consultation with constituency members, and developing strategies for effective advocacy on the issues to mobilize support amongst other Board constituencies;
- d. Support for monitoring and analysis of grant portfolios; and
- e. Logistical and organizational support for constituency participation in Board and Committee meetings.

3.4 Ensuring adequate resourcing: An action plan and a resource mobilization plan will be developed to support the reformed functioning of the constituencies. These will take into account available Global Fund constituency support, non-Global Fund financial support that could be sourced, including in-kind support. A call for expressions of interest to provide Bureau services will be launched by the Constituencies following validation of the Manual of Procedures.

July 11, 2012

4. Extended mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group

The Constituencies instruct the Ad Hoc Working Group to continue development of these reforms on its behalf until further notice.

5. Timeline and Next Steps

As noted in the final consensus point, the Ad Hoc Working Group has been asked to undertake initial implementation of the agreed-upon priority changes. The Working Group developed a preliminary timeline and set of next steps based in part on important dates and events moving forward, including the September 2012 Global Fund Board meeting, the November 2012 Board meeting and the scheduled change in delegations' Board Members and ABMs in May 2013. The following next steps, noted at the conclusion of the consultation, were designed to effect change as rapidly as possible, with some scope for "interim" changes to meet particularly critical objectives. Additional steps to the reform process will be proposed to the constituencies as their need and utility become apparent.

By 15 August 2012: The Ad Hoc Working Group will have completed a zero draft of a procedures manual, including terms of reference (ToRs) and standard operating procedures (SOPs), as called for in the consensus points. The draft will be edited and harmonized for style and consistency before being translated into French (and English, for sections written in French).

By 25 August 2012: The harmonized zero draft of the procedures manual in two languages will be completed for review by the constituencies. It will then be translated into Portuguese as well.

September 2012: If funding can be obtained, the Ad Hoc Working Group will hold a face-to-face meeting in Geneva immediately prior to the Global Fund Board meeting scheduled for 12-14 September. The objectives of the meeting will be to finalize validation of the procedures manual and clarify next steps in the reform process, including resource mobilization.

September-October 2012: A resource mobilization effort will be launched to realize the implementation of agreed-upon priorities, including the establishment of a single Bureau to provide effective technical and communications services to the African constituencies.

July 11, 2012

Annex 1. Africa Input in ‘Better Grants for Increased Impact’ Project

Note: This annex refers to a part of the consultation that did not directly address the main topic of Africa constituency representation. It was included following a request from the Global Fund to utilize the opportunity presented by the gathering of high-level implementers to solicit input regarding a critical Global Fund initiative.

Mark Eldon-Edington, the director of the Global Fund Grant Management division, delivered a presentation during the consultation on an initiative under way at the Global Fund called “Better Grants for Increased Impact”. Through the initiative—a core element of the ongoing reform process associated with the Global Fund Strategy 2012-2016: Investing for Impact—the Global Fund aims to address concerns raised by implementers around how it operates. The “Better Grants” project is linked to three of the five strategic objectives of the Strategy: invest more strategically, evolve the funding model, and actively support grant implementation success.

The Global Fund is seeking input from all stakeholders in a range of ways as it considers new approaches and strategies through the initiative. The 9-11 July Joint Africa Constituency Meeting was considered part of that process. Eldon-Edington’s presentation therefore included a series of discussion questions for break-out groups around four main themes: investing for impact, access to funding, streamlining processes, and risk/assurance. Two of eight total groups focused on each of the four themes and associated questions. A dedicated rapporteur for each group reported back directly to the Grant Management division.

The following are among other opportunities for consultations with Africa from June through September 2012, as noted by Eldon-Edington:

- 22-26 July 2012: Extensive consultations at the International AIDS Conference in Washington, DC with representatives from African Ministries of Health and NGOs
- July or August (to be determined): In-depth consultation workshop in Africa with Global Fund Principal Recipients, CCM chairs and sub-recipients
- 9-11 July and 29-31 August: Delegates from Eastern and Southern Africa attending meetings of the Strategy, Investment and Impact Committee (SIIC)
- 12-13 September: Delegates from across Africa attending the Global Fund Board meeting
- July-August 2012: Ongoing country visits to countries including Botswana, Central African Republic, Côte d’Ivoire, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania/Zanzibar, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

July 11, 2012

This report is made possible by the support of the American People through USAID and the United States President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief. The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of the Grant Management Solutions project and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID; the United States Government; or the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.