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What is Grant Management Solutions?

- $99.9M contract awarded and managed by USAID
- Actual obligated amount = $75.7M
- Financing from the 5% withholding from the US contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria
What was GMS really trying to do?

- Ensure that the countries seize the opportunity created by the enormous and unique potential of the Global Fund to scale up the national efforts against AIDS, TB and malaria
  
  *By*

- Unblocking urgent and systemic bottlenecks to governance and performance.

*Don’t waste the moment!*

*Don’t waste the money!*
The GMS partnership:
29 partner companies in 16 countries
GMS: 3 objectives

- **Objective 1** (61%): Short-term and limited medium-term technical support

- **Objective 2** (29%): Capacity strengthening of regional technical-support partners and consultants

- **Objective 3** (10%): Tools and best practices disseminated via electronic platforms
GMS: 4 technical areas

- Governance and oversight (CCM, RCMs)
- Grants, financial and risk management, partnership coordination (PRs)
- Pharmaceutical and supply management
- Monitoring, evaluation and reporting (PRs, CCMs)
The New Funding Model 2013-2017: GMS intervention points

- GMS specialty
- National Strategic Plan determined by country
- Concept Note
- TRP
- GAC
- Grant-Making
- 2nd GAC
- Board
- Grant Implementation 3 years

CCM Eligibility & Performance Assessment

- Performance Improvement Plan
- CCM Eligibility Screening by Secretariat
- GMS specialty
- GMS specialty
- GMS specialty
Demand for Objective 1 Services

- 350 grants
- $13.3 B
- 49% of Global Fund portfolio

174 requests = 180 GMS assignments
80 client countries

GMS2 countries by Fragile States Index

- Sustainable (<30)
- Stable (30 – 70)
- Warning (70 – 100)
- Alert (>100)
17 Global Fund “High Impact” Countries were GMS clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Africa 1</th>
<th>Africa 2</th>
<th>Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire ✓</td>
<td>Ethiopia ✓</td>
<td>Bangladesh ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo ✓</td>
<td>Kenya ✓</td>
<td>India ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana ✓</td>
<td>Mozambique ✓</td>
<td>Indonesia ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria ✓</td>
<td>Uganda ✓</td>
<td>Myanmar ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sudan ✓</td>
<td>Zambia ✓</td>
<td>Pakistan ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa ✓</td>
<td>Zimbabwe ✓</td>
<td>Philippines ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania ✓</td>
<td>Vietnam ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zanzibar ✓</td>
<td>Thailand ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GMS supported 52 CCMs, 3 RCMs

- 100% of CCMs deemed eligible
- 85% of CCMs register improvements in their PIPs
GMS supported 134 PRs/grants = 24% of Global Fund portfolio
Highly uncertain assignments: Positive outcomes

- Chad: Making a difficult decision in 2014
- Burundi: Supporting grant making during a civil war

Somalia Global Fund Steering Committee member
Support to Burundi

2014: CCM EPA

2015: Grant making (Remote support: 4 PRs and 4 grants). Conducted in Kampala/Uganda because of civil war

2016: Risk Management and start up support

2017: Grant making (on site support: 5 PRs and 3 diseases)
How did we do it?
The GMS technical engine

- Tools and innovative approaches
- Access to trained, expert consultants
- Dialogue with client
- Technical supervision, oversight

GMS technical engine: technical managers, experts, directors
Objective 2: Capacity building

- Consultant training and certification
- Regional partner strengthening
Consultant training and certification: 506 active consultants in 2017
Blended learning approach: 13 events, 286 persons trained

- Work planning to meet Global Fund deadlines
- Mastering Global Fund templates
- Role plays for facilitation, negotiation skills
- Teamwork skills
GMS Learning Hub: Continuing education, Global Fund updates

Virtual Courses Participation
19 courses, 400 users, 1313 course participants
Use of regional consultants in GMS teams 2007 vs. 2017

- **2007**: 27% Global Fund regional consultants, 73% International consultants
- **2017**: 86% Global Fund regional consultants, 14% International consultants
Objective 2: Regional partner strengthening
PR Business Performance: **Bids versus Wins**

April 2015-August 2017

**Other bilateral, country specific opportunities**
- April 2015: 3
- May 2015: 1
- June 2015: 5
- July 2015: 9
- August 2015: 12
- September 2015: 16
- October 2015: 13
- November 2015: 15
- December 2015: 48
- January 2016: 36
- February 2016: 18
- March 2016: 27
- April 2016: 20
- May 2016: 831

**Global Fund IQCs, Task Orders**
- June 2015: 12
- July 2015: 13
- August 2015: 15
- September 2015: 18
- October 2015: 20
- November 2015: 27
- December 2015: 20
- January 2016: 831

**GMS consultant selection**
# Objective 3: Tools and best practices

## Country Coordinating Mechanism (CCM)/Regional Coordinating Mechanism (RCM) Members and Their Potential Conflicts of Interest (COIs) at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Member Name, CCM Position</th>
<th>Organization, Title</th>
<th>CCM/RCM Sector</th>
<th>Oversight Committee Member</th>
<th>Proposal Development Team Member</th>
<th>Technical Committee Member</th>
<th>Executive Committee Member</th>
<th>Officer or Executive Committee Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List each CCM/RCM member and alternate, the offices or committee assignments they hold, and whether their institution is a principal recipient or subrecipient of Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria grants.

Cells will be highlighted in pink if a potential COI exists. Each case should be discussed to determine how to manage the COI.

---

**Checklist for Establishing a Project Implementation Unit/Project Management Unit/Grant Management Unit**

**Why create a project implementation unit (PIU), project management unit (PMU), or grant management unit (GMU)?**

Government entities that are principal recipients (PRs) or sub-recipients of grants from the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria may decide to establish an organizational unit within the ministry that is dedicated to managing the grant. While MOHs may fund an entity to manage a project effectively and to focus on the programs grants fund through a formally structured, dedicated grant management unit. The structure and purpose of the unit will vary, depending on the country, such as a project management unit (PMU), project management unit (PMU), or grant-management unit (GMU). In some cases, the Global Fund may require the PMU to implement the MDG/CCM/RCM, be ensuring that this requirement does not divert funds under the grant for managing this requirement as "management action" during preparation. The Global Fund may take such a requirement in its concerned that without the centralization and organizational models a decentralized grant management unit can provide, the PRs will not be able to fulfill its management role due to inadequate staff.
Suite of four dashboard tools for CCMs and PRs

PR Management Dashboard - The cornerstone of the dashboard suite

CCM Summary

SR Management Tool

Regional Dashboard
GMS+ Global Fund + SAP = Grant dashboards
Measuring Results of Technical Assistance

Logic Model:

- Issue to be addressed
- Intervention
- Deliverables
- Immediate Results
- Intermediate Results
- Changes in Grant Rating
- Health Impact

Attribution diminishes with distance from GMS intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant rating</th>
<th>Performance category</th>
<th>Progress against targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
<td>90 – 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>60 – 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Inadequate but potential demonstrated</td>
<td>30 – 59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>&lt; 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expected results of dashboard use

Immediate results: Management Improves

- Improved data quality
- Increased PR-SR dialogue
- Improved dialogue with CCM

Intermediate results: Implementation Improves

- Increased financial absorption
- Prevention of stock outs
- Improvement in prog. indicators
- Reduced PSM waste and risk

Impact on health outcomes

- Improved programmatic performance (better grant ratings)
- Improved health outcomes
Dashboard assessment 2017

All 27 countries adopting dashboards:
- 33% High Impact countries, 75% AFRO region
- Grants with signed value of $4.8 billion
- 95 PRs (50% public sector)
  - 60 PRs > 12 months, 35 PRs < 6 months
- 18 CCMs using the CCM Summary
GMS1: Impact of CCM interventions on grant performance ratings

- 79% improvement to B1 for grants rated B2 or C prior to oversight strengthening
- Strong positive association between complete, periodic grant oversight by CCMs and grant performance
Regression analysis of dashboard assessment data

Dashboard use > 12 months leads to:

- Improved data quality \( (p<0.01) \)
- Improved PR/SR communication on performance, management actions \( (p<0.05) \)
- Improved PR communication with the CCM \( (p<0.05) \)
- Reduced health products wastage \( (p<0.1) \)

Dashboard adoption scores by country > 12 months since technical support ended
Regression analysis of dashboard impact data

Which lead to:

• Improved funds absorption (p<0.01)
• Improved FPM grant ratings (p<0.05)
Going to scale: The paradigm shift

How far have we gotten?
Global Fund stakeholders are invited to capitalize on the assets and momentum created by GMS: the handover is underway.