



Global Fund Advocates Network 5th Replenishment Meeting Amsterdam – January 26th-28th 2016

 [*Download all slideshows presented at the meeting*](#)

Overview of key meeting points and outcomes

General challenges

- The plans and strategies for the three diseases show a clear and urgent need for increased funding NOW of the responses. Even maintenance will cause a rebound. They provide essential context for the replenishment but also for the full effort needed to fight the 3 diseases.
- However, even if the Global Fund receives its requested \$13bn during replenishment, there is still a large gap in financing: \$13bn is just going to keep us afloat – we need new money, to leverage domestic financing, and to make sure funding goes above numbers in current bilateral funding.
- Full global need vs. Global Fund's need (Investment Case) – need to bring together global plans without complicating the message.
- Global health is not high on the agenda for many political leaders right now. The refugee crisis has diverted large amounts of ODA towards in-country refugee support.
- Foreign exchange (FOREX) issues have played a huge role in resources available during this latest allocation period. FOREX also adds a complexity on reporting how much money is raised at the pledging conference because this is done in USD.
- The \$12bn for 2014-2016 now is actually less because the GF has been receiving less actual USD than pledged because many currencies have decreased against the dollar.

- “End of the epidemics” cannot be the only message. Some diseases are overlooked by certain countries – need to look at more overall persuasive arguments.

5th Replenishment prospects

- The Global Fund believes there’s more potential for increase than decrease amongst top 15 donors, particularly amongst 5 countries within G7. It’s looking positive for the US, UK, Germany, EC, Canada, Australia, Norway, Italy, Belgium, Ireland, Spain and some smaller donors. Likely to have maintenance in France, Japan, Netherlands.
- Current target of \$13bn is actually ambitious in terms of current exchange rates because overall it’s actually aiming for a 20% increase by donors (equals over \$15bn in 2013 USD). Civil society can ask for as much as they can, but the GF’s amount is a political decision based on an expectation of how much it can raise.
- The upside of FOREX is that countries convert dollars to local currency to buy what they need 60% of the time, so they’ll have increased buying power. Therefore we lose 40% in-country when they buy supplies outside of the country. If countries have grants in euros it doesn’t affect them at all.
- GF working on domestic resourcing champions.

What do our “asks” need to be?

How do we persuade governments for more money even when they know the Global Fund is an effective mechanism to fight the diseases? It is no longer simply that donors need to be “convinced” about the GF model or that they need “proof” it is an open, transparent, accountable organization, but they do need something that will convince them that the time is now:

- Talk to the urgency, “we cannot lose this window of opportunity”
- Connect to other issues that countries are excited about – health systems, universal health coverage, women and girls, etc.
- Couch need in “global health security” issues
- Personalize the disease and incidence data
- Request new R&D and technology

- The Global Fund has demonstrated it can leverage higher levels of domestic investment
- Fight framing of justification for cuts – shame those countries that choose to cut pledges
- The Investment Case has given us this great tool of what can be done with each additional 100 million
- We need to maintain presence in MICs for human rights, key populations - percent of portfolio in MICs focused on key populations is 80-90%

What are our best synergies?

- Working with implementing country advocates to provide real voices in campaigning
- Japan-Italy-Canada – G7 presidencies could influence each other.
- GFAN Africa & GFAN Asia-Pacific hubs can support campaigning within respective regions and in donor countries that have specific regional interests.
- GF starting to discuss how to transition countries possibly via regional development banks and Global Fund task team - need in-country supporters to promote this

Some of the key events, campaigns and processes that were identified during the GFAN meeting include:

- The InterParliamentary Union (IPU) and its regular meetings are an opportunity to push for discussions, resolutions and advocacy outcomes related to Global Fund.
- Global TB Caucus: at a previous UNION conference, parliamentarians signed the Barcelona Declaration to work to end TB and use parliamentary powers to do so. Now 1000 parliamentarians from over 100 countries have signed this. There will be 10 new parliamentary caucuses created to work towards engagement in ending TB that can be harnessed through its Secretariat to support GF Replenishment.
- Mobilizing domestic resources for HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria and the efficient allocation of them that supports care and treatment for all is important in the fight against the diseases but also as a signal to donors. The GF's Investment

Case makes some key arguments and outlines the need for an increase of domestic funding of 17% per year over the next few years.

- Key conferences like Women Deliver and AIDS 2016 in Durban (and the associated side and pre-conferences including TB 2016) provide an opportunity to engage broader audiences and take place at key times in the lead up to a Fall pledging to engage donors
- We can leverage the High Level Meeting on AIDS (June) and advocate for strong Global Fund replenishment messaging during the event and in the outcome document.
- Support local leadership around the G7 in Japan to try and get strong statements about the Global Fund from the G7 as a group and leaders individually.
- Build out a campaign that focuses on the “expression of demand” – i.e. make clear that the demand for treatment is still there, that although there has been significant progress, challenges remain; ensure rapid uptake of technologies is built into community and key populations “demands” and in concept notes, etc. - important drivers of why replenishment and a full replenishment is important this year.

What do we need?

- Capture data better showing how increased investment creates greater returns
- Domestic investment examples
- Ensure full expression of demand from implementing countries in grant proposals.

Actions/Activities to come from GFAN

- GFAN Cost of Inaction report will speak to why maintenance is not an option, why investing now is needed and examine how foreign exchange plays a role in affecting the Fund's purchasing power from pledges and contributions
- GFAN Speakers Bureau – speakers ready to work on GFAN members' replenishment campaigning; photos & videos will be out soon