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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAI</td>
<td>AIDS Accountability International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCM</td>
<td>Country Co-ordinating Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoI/CI</td>
<td>Conflict of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EANNASO</td>
<td>Eastern Africa National Networks of AIDS Service Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Eligibility Performance Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>Faith-Based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSW</td>
<td>Women who have Sex with Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF/GFATM</td>
<td>Global Fund for AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDU</td>
<td>Injecting drug users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAP</td>
<td>Key Affected Populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Key Populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR TB</td>
<td>Multi-Drug-Resistant Tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSM</td>
<td>Men who have sex with men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFM</td>
<td>New funding model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCM</td>
<td>National Coordinating Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO</td>
<td>Non-Profit Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIG</td>
<td>Office of the Inspector-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAM</td>
<td>People Affected by Malaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATB</td>
<td>People Affected by Tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP</td>
<td>Performance Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLWDD</td>
<td>People Living with the Diseases of HIV, TB and malaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLWHIV</td>
<td>People Living with HIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Primary Recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA</td>
<td>Request for Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Subsidiary Recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR</td>
<td>Sub-Subsidiary Recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Sex Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effective Country Coordinating Mechanisms (CCMs) are a vital part of the Global Fund architecture at country level. CCMs are responsible for submitting requests for funding and for providing oversight during implementation. With the introduction of the Global Fund’s New Funding Model (NFM) in March 2014, CCMs play an even more important central role, convene stakeholders to engage meaningfully in inclusive country dialogue, agree on funding split, and participate in the development of National Strategic Plan (NSP) discussions for the three diseases at country level.

With the enhanced responsibility, the NFM also introduced more rigorous CCM assessment processes. Previously, CCMs submitted a self-assessment attached to their proposal. Now, CCM self-assessments are facilitated by conducted by an external consultant – either the International HIV/AIDS Alliance or Grant Management Solutions for and on behalf of the CCM Hub. Further, CCMs are also mandated to have a performance improvement plan to accompany their assessment, ensuring that areas of weakness are addressed in an open and transparent manner.

Despite the importance of CCMs in Global Fund decision-making at country level, studies have flagged issues with CCM membership balance, poor representation and limited constituency feedback. Further, the recent audit report from the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) found several persistent shortcomings with CCM performance:

- 10% of the 50 countries reviewed did not have the required oversight committee;
- More than half of the countries did not have specific information on roles, timelines, and budgets in their oversight plans, or they had oversight plans that were outdated;
- 62% of the CCMs were non-compliant with the requirement of seeking feedback from non CCM members and from people living with and/or affected with the disease;
- More than half of the 45 CCMs that have oversight bodies did not adequately discuss challenges with the PRs to identify problems and explore solutions;
- 58% of the CCMs had not shared oversight reports with country stakeholders and the Global Fund Secretariat in the previous six months; and
- 26% did not share the oversight reports with relevant stakeholders in a timely manner that could have ensured well-timed remedial action.

In light of the OIG CCM Audit, and the enhanced role of CCMs in country level disease governance in the Funding Model, there is a need for a wide range of stakeholders to be empowered to demand improved CCM performance. While the move to have an external consultant to facilitate the CCM Eligibility & Performance Assessments (EPA) and the development of Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) to guide the subsequent strengthening of the CCM is an improvement, the fact that these EPAs and PIPs are not public is an obstacle to accountability.

Problem Statement

Vested stakeholders and communities must be able to use CCM assessments and improvement plans as accountability mechanisms to demand better performance.

Added to this is that fact that currently CCM Assessment & Performance Improvement Plans lack questions that speak to quality of performance such as meaningful engagement, use of documentation and information, etc.

Civil society needs to be further engaged with the CCM Assessment & Performance Improvement Plans in order to hold stakeholders accountable. Similarly, these same civil society watchdogs and affected communities must have the tools, knowledge and information they need to be able to measure the performance of the CCM members that represent them and to hold CCMs accountable.
About the research

The project comprises of two types of research:

The Country CCM Shadow Reports
These reports drill down into issues at country level and assess CCM performance from the perspectives of both CCM members as well as the perspective of other stakeholders such as principal recipients and sub recipients. The report is based on the GFATM CCM Audit Progress Assessment Tool but also include various other questions that are seen to be lacking in the existing audits by Geneva. The reason why the research is considered a shadow reporting exercise is that methodologically and in terms of content we are hoping to build and improve on the methods being used by Geneva at this time. Shadow reports are used to supplement and/or provide alternative information to that which was submitted in the original reports. In this work, our aim is the same: to supplement and/or provide alternative information to that found in the original CCM audits.

The Civil Society CCM Scorecard and Country CCM Shadow Reports will not duplicate the Global Fund supported Eligibility and Performance Assessments (EPAs). This is because whilst EPAs are consultant facilitated self-assessments of CCMs that are largely driven by the Global Fund to facilitate accountability using a top down approach; the Civil Society CCM Scorecard and Country CCM Shadow Reports will be undertaken by civil society in country, using a bottom up approach. In addition, the Civil Society CCM Scorecard and Country CCM Shadow Reports sought to interview both CCM members as well as implementing partners (principal recipients (PRs) and sub-recipients (SRs)) who interact with CCMs. The research for the Civil Society Scorecard and the Country CCM Shadow Reports was facilitated by civil society resident in country so the exercise could both empower civil society and sustain the culture of demanding accountability from CCMs in country and be replicated across other grant implementers.

The Civil Society CCM Scorecard
A comparative analysis that ranks the participating countries against each other in terms of their performance. Using the AAI Scorecard methodology, data from the Country CCM Shadow Reports is analyzed and countries are graded on their performance, as a means to uncover best and worst practice, who is ahead, who is falling behind, and other similarities and differences that might make for good entry points for advocacy.

Focus Countries
Nine countries participated in the research: Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Nigeria, Rwanda, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia.

Expected Outcomes

Long term goal
More accountable CCMs.

Medium term objective
Increased transparency around CCM performance and improvement plans.

Short term aim
Empowered civil society and community groups who can do effective shadow reporting.
Methodology

The technical team (AAI and EANNASO) developed a questionnaire based on the Global Fund Eligibility and Performance Assessments (EPAs) questionnaire (called the Progress Assessment Tool). AAI almost exclusively uses Participatory Action research (PAR) for field research, a best practice in which community and country civil society partners co-developed the methodology, research tools, conducted the research and wrote the final reports and analysis.

Local civil society, who do not sit on the CCM and do not receive Global Fund money, were identified to do conduct the research at country level, including data collection and analysis. We selected 3 local watchdogs in each of the 9 countries for a total of 27 local watch dogs to be trained, mentored and supported to do the research. The training also equipped civil society with skills to enable them to engage with the CCM Secretariat to plan and schedule the interviews and FGDs. Civil society conducted interviews to collect data using a mix of questionnaire interviews and focused group discussions (FGD). Comprehensive questionnaires with open ended questions and FGD guides were provided to civil society; these allowed for probing and discussions whilst collecting data.

First, the core group of respondents from the CCM for the interview and focus group discussions were drawn from a cross section of CCM members representing the respective governments, faith based, civil society, private sector, key populations, people affected by the diseases, the bi lateral and multi-lateral partners and the CCM secretariat. Civil society conducting the research were expected to undertake a minimum of eight face to face interviews and conduct one focus group discussion of not less than six CCM members.

These interviews and a FGD collectively included all of the following sectors: government, faith based, civil society, private sector, key populations, people affected by the diseases, the bi lateral and multi-lateral partners and the CCM secretariat.

Secondly, civil society also conducted a FGD of 10-12 non CCM members mainly drawn from implementing government and civil society PRs and SRs. The second FGD enabled the research to get the perspectives of non CCM members who have interacted with the CCM. Key areas of discussion included:

- How they have benefitted from the oversight function of the CCM;
- How, when and the outcomes of the oversight field visit;
- If the oversight reports and outcomes are formally shared and published through the CCM website
- Whether women and KPs are adequately represented on the CCM;
- If civil society members were elected/selected in an open and transparent manner;
- An understanding of the level of meaningful participation of KPs in CCM leadership;
- An understanding of the level of meaningful participation of KPs informal and ad hoc committees;
- The methods of soliciting KP input and then this feedback to the larger constituency;
- Conflict of Interest (COI) e.g. how grant implementers (SRs) who are also CCM members manage COI in CCM meetings etc.
One aim was to build the capacity of the local civil society watchdogs to engage with a variety of different research techniques and data gathering modalities, so the following will contribute to this objective:

- Civil society received training on FGDs at the workshop;
- Civil society completed hard copies of the questionnaires at country level and then also captured the data online into a survey monkey.
- Civil society developed their own 2-3 page analysis of each of the 2 FGDs, talking about key findings (estimate 5-8 findings) and recommending strategic entry points for advocacy (estimate 3-5)
- In addition to this, civil society wrote their own 5-8 page analysis of all of the data as they understood and interpreted it and submitted this to the technical team. This analysis formed the basis of all of the research they conducted, and informed the technical team’s analysis of the data.

Sub-grants were made to each of the local watchdogs to support their implementation of the shadow reporting. The content from the country data collectors, once entered into the survey monkey tool, was analysed by AAI, presented to EANNASO and country teams at a meeting in Kigali, Rwanda in February 2017, and feedback from this meeting and from email correspondence from country teams was included to develop the final reports.

Methodologically it is important to note the dates of when the shadow EPAs and the Geneva EPAs were conducted as differences could be a result of changes over time. All the shadow EPA research was conducted between November 2016 and February 2017. Malawi’s Geneva EPAs were submitted on the 2016-09-13.
Analysis

CCM Performance
All CCMs are required to meet the following six requirements to be eligible for Global Fund financing:

1. A transparent and inclusive concept note development process;
2. An open and transparent Principal Recipient selection process;
3. Oversight planning and implementation;
4. Membership of affected communities on the CCM;
5. Processes for non-government CCM member selection; and
6. Management of conflict of interest on CCMs.

Below is a highlight of the research findings as per the above eligibility requirements:

1. Transparent and inclusive concept note development.
Based on the tools that we used during the scorecard process there were no questions that directly linked to the issues of the development of the concept note process and the Principal Recipient selection process in-country. So all members never touched on those issues although members, more especially the Non-CCM members, wanted this issue be talked about as well, but we were restricted from going overboard.

From the findings, all members from affected communities are well represented on the CCM and they attend the CCM meetings all the time, while some are also in different committees like the Oversight Committee, but there are no proper mechanisms to remove non-performing CCM members from the CCM apart from waiting until the end of their term.

Gender has been mainstreamed in the CCM governance documents such as the constitution, by-laws, and oversight guidelines and the representation is gender balanced. It was found that this has helped to mainstream gender in concept notes and other programming planning at CCM level. As long as the CCM representation is gender balanced, there is no need to consider having a gender expert on the CCM.

The performance of GFATM was rated to be good, but most CCM members were not aware of the existence and the functions of the CCM Hub. However, concerns were raised in terms of arranging missions on very short notice, that the times of meetings are constrained and not all relevant issues are discussed, and also delay regarding the provision of feedback on issues that have been referred to the GFATM.

The GFATM should communicate their missions in good time, have adequate time for discussions to ensure all the relevant issues are discussed, and also improve on providing feedback on issues that have been referred to them.
2. An Open and Transparent PR Selection process

From the FDGs and face to face interviews, CSOs members recommended that the selection of the PR should be transparent by advertising the PR selection in newspapers and on the radio, and this should include a clear selection criteria. The Findings are that currently these are not sufficiently done.

The CCM allows observers to attend the CCM meetings but not speak. It was however found that mostly the observers are from the government side and development partners but not necessarily from civil society. Civil society actors should be encouraged to participate in CCM meetings as observers.

There is good and proper communication inside the CCM. However, it was noted that communication from the CCM secretariat to the members in most times is delayed.

The communication between the CCM and other stakeholders is almost non-existent as evidenced by a lack of information for most stakeholders on the CCM's operations. Communication from the CCM Secretariat to members is often delayed – and there is no communication between the CCM Secretariat and the stakeholders.

“Let’s advertise the selection of PR in newspapers.”

There is a need for written communication from CCM Secretariat to its members and this should be timely. The CCM Secretariat should improve its communication with stakeholders through radio announcements; newspaper adverts so that the stakeholders and the public should be aware of the CCM’s operations.

3. Oversight Planning and Implementation

Question: Oversight: How would you rate the performance of the oversight body?
The CCM is fulfilling its oversight role and is inclusive as members of the civil society are also part of the Oversight Committee. The Oversight Committee has its own meetings where it receives reports from PRs and provides its report at the CCM meeting and it also conducts site visits in order to get first-hand information.

Generally, the CCM allows observers to attend the CCM meetings but not speak. Considering that civil society organisations are supposed to be key members of the Oversight Committee, the membership is very compromised due to the fact that there was no transparency in terms of how some civil society representatives found their way onto the CCM. This was also partly because some civil society constituencies are not properly organised and it was very difficult to have a transparent way of identifying some of the representatives, as such the performance of the oversight body was found to be of acceptable quality. Among all the CSOs in the CCM, it’s only the PLHIV constituency that has a clear process for selection of the member that has to go and represent them, but for the rest, the selection process is not clear up to now: how was the selection done, and how did they become members; some did not know the procedures of selection.

All the civil society constituencies should be properly organised and constituted. There should be a very transparent and accountable way of identifying civil society representatives appointed to the CCM. The CCM Secretariat should ensure there is proper documentation in terms of how civil society representatives were identified, including following up with individual constituencies in order to verify the process.

“Certain assignments are done independently though other remain questionable.”

“We should look at the expenditures, but (key affected populations (KAP) and people living with the diseases (PLWD)) both are represented in the (oversight) Committee (,) to make sure that their sector are benefiting from the intervention.”
4. Membership of affected communities in the CCM

Commonly KAPs and PLWDs are able to attend CCM meetings but do not participate meaningfully, do not speak and be heard, and therefore are not able to influence decisions. There is a major concern regarding the civil society constituencies in terms of them being properly constituted, transparency and accountability with the selection of the CSO representatives, and this therefore compromises their ability to speak and be heard and influence decisions. The civil society constituencies should be properly constituted and defined, and the selection of their representatives should be transparent and accountable in order to select the representatives with the ability and capacity to speak and be heard and influence decisions.

“Most of the time CCM is dominated by donor community and Government and ill represented of CSOs.”

“The composition is there and quality of member should be improved.”

“Some constituencies of the KPs such as MSM have been missing in CCM undertakings.”

“Some constituencies of PLWD are themselves not very organized such as the TB constituency and the Malaria constituency but this is being worked out.”

5. Process for non-government CCM member selection

Save for only one constituency of civil society, PLWHIV, there is literally no constituency consultation by the civil society representatives. There is no proper mechanism and support to enable civil society representatives to consult their constituencies. This was also attributed to the fact that in some cases the constituencies are not properly defined. Even where constituencies are properly defined, meetings don't take place to agree on representatives to the CCM, or feedback to the membership: this is attributed to a lack of funds for the meetings, or to a lack of scheduled meetings to determine such issues.
The CCM Secretariat should provide resources and support for constituency consultations. The CCM Secretariat should develop a clear policy on constituency consultation. Constituencies should improvise accountability mechanisms to agree on membership and feedback.

“In some constituencies such as PLHIV the process was transparent while in some constituencies such as TB, KPs, NGO the selection was not transparent.”

Owing to the constrained capacity of the CCM secretariat, some new CSO representatives have not been oriented to the CCM. The other major key finding was that some Alternate Delegates from the CSO representatives have not yet been contacted by the CCM secretariat and therefore are not aware of their selection to be Alternate Delegates to the CCM. The capacity of the CCM Secretariat should be strengthened in terms of human resources.

All the CSO representatives to the CCM should be properly oriented on their role. All the CSO Alternate Delegates to the CCM should be contacted and be informed about their selection to the CCM as Alternate Delegates.

6. Management on Conflict of Interests on CCMs

The conflict of interest policy is available and before the start of each meeting, members are required to declare their conflict of interest on any item of the agenda. There is a clear mechanism of managing the conflict of interest that all members are adhering to make the process transparent and accountable.
Question: Are there any conflicts of interest in the CCM?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Sometimes/Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Rwanda, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia.
**Analysis**

From the face-to-face and focus group discussion for CCMs members it showed clearly that all member sign the COI before any meetings start and some members have been force to leave the membership to CCM because of the COI. Declaring conflicts of interest was found to be a standing agenda item for all the CCM meetings. The practice of declaring a conflict of interest before the start of any CCM meeting should be continued and encouraged.

**EPA Tool & Process**

The general feeling was that the assessments of CCMs do not measure the quality of the CCM’s work but rather whether something is done, and not how well it is done. It was found that the quality of how well something was done was not very much emphasised. The assessments should focus on quality issues and not just whether something is done. After the EPA, feedback should be given to the CCM members and Non-CCM members.

**PIP Tool and Process**

The Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) addresses the CCM performance gap. It was found that while the PIP addresses the CCM performance gaps, not much in terms of implementation is done to ensure the identified gaps are actually addressed. All the gaps identified during the PIP should be addressed as a matter of urgency as some gaps keep on recurring in several PIPs.

**CCM Scorecard & Shadow Report Tool & Process**

**Strengths**

The meeting with both CCM and Non-CCM members were good.

Holding the FDGs and face-to-face interviews enriched the process, because during the FDGs, members might come with good points that they forgot during face-to-face interviews.

**Weaknesses**

Too many questions were overlapping, so there is a need to streamline the questions. The report template did not tally with the format of the questionnaire. There were a lot of additional requirements which we were not informed of during the training e.g: the validation of the report with the CCM's Survey Monkey was not properly explained.

The CCM does not inform Non-CCM members of when and where meetings will take place. Most stakeholders and the general public are not aware of when and where CCM meetings will be taking place.

The CCM Secretariat should publicise the entity so that the general public is aware of its existence and functions. The CCM Secretariat should make the public aware of its meetings through radio announcements and newspaper adverts.
Overall there is good and proper communication inside the CCM. However it was noted that communication from the CCM secretariat to the members in most cases is delayed. The communication between the CCM and other stakeholders is almost non-existent as evidenced by the lack of information for most stakeholders on the CCM’s operations. Communication from the CCM Secretariat to members is often delayed. There is no communication between the CCM Secretariat and the stakeholders. Written communication from the CCM Secretariat to its members should be timely. The CCM Secretariat should improve its communication with stakeholders through radio announcements and newspaper adverts so that the stakeholders and the general public should be aware of the CCM’s operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ghana</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Malawi</th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
<th>Rwanda</th>
<th>Swaziland</th>
<th>Tanzania</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>Zambia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can the existing EPA be improved on?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does your country Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) address the CCM’s performance gaps?

Yes | No | I don’t know
---|---|---
Ghana | | |
Kenya | | |
Malawi | | |
Nigeria | | |
Rwanda | | |
Swaziland | | |
Tanzania | | |
Uganda | | |
Zambia | | |
Findings

Finding 1: CSO CCM member election not transparent nor accountable
Civil society organisations are not properly constituted, and lack transparency and accountability in their processes of selecting representatives to the CCM. This compromises their ability to speak and be heard and influence decisions. Some CSO constituencies are not properly defined and constituted. Some new CSO representatives have not been oriented to the CCM, while some Alternate Delegates have not even been informed of their selection.

Finding 2: CCM struggles with some duties and requires regulatory support
While CCM Leadership works hard and abides by COI, PIP and EPA processes, it was found that there are no clear guidelines and mechanisms that can be used to remove non-performing CCM members. CCM leadership is often rushed and time-constrained because of other duties, and there is a lack of quality control regarding CCM operations, and a consistent failure to address gaps identified by the PIP.

Finding 3: CCM secretariat has weak communications with stakeholders
The CCM Secretariat is slow to communicate with CCM members, and has zero communications with other stakeholders and constituencies. This renders it invisible to many KAPs and CSOs.

Generally, the quality of civil society sector representation is poor due to lack of properly defined CSO constituencies as well as to a lack of transparency and accountability in selecting the CSO representatives. Civil society constituencies should be properly defined and constituted, the selection of CSO representatives at the CCM should be very transparent and accountable, new CCM members should be properly oriented, CSO representatives at the CCM should be supported with resources to enable constituency consultation, meetings of the CCM should be well publicised and the capacity of both the CCM Secretariat and CSO representatives should be strengthened.

Members of the CCM were satisfied with the performance of the CCM Leadership. But while the performance of the CCM Leadership was found to be satisfactory, sometimes CCM business is rushed owing to the fact that the CCM Leadership is often extremely busy with their other duties. CCM business should be given adequate time so that deliberations are not rushed through.
Recommendations

The CCM Secretariat should publicise the entity so that the general public is aware of its existence, its meetings and operations through radio announcements and newspaper adverts, and civil society actors should be encouraged to participate in CCM meetings as observers.

The civil society constituencies should be properly constituted and defined, the selection of its representatives should be transparent and accountable in order to select the representatives with the ability and capacity to speak and be heard and influence decisions.

The capacity of the CCM Secretariat should be strengthened in terms of human resources: all the CSO representatives to the CCM should be properly oriented on their roles; and the CSO Alternate Delegates to the CCM should be informed about their selection to the CCM.

Proper guidelines and mechanisms should be developed to facilitate the removal on non-performing CCM members even before the end of their term

CCM business should be given adequate time so that deliberations are not rushed through.

The GFATM should communicate their missions in good time, have adequate time for discussions to ensure all the relevant issues are discussed and also improve on providing feedback on issues that have been referred to them.

EPA and PIP assessments should focus on quality issues and not just on whether or not something is done – and gaps identified must be addressed and not just allowed to roll over until the next assessment. After the EPA and PIP, feedback should be given to the CCM members and Non-CCM members.
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